National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE COMPLEXITIES SURROUNDING THE QUEST FOR FATHERHOOD IN "THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV"

BY

PATRICIA MARY ANDREWS

©

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
RUSSIAN LITERATURE

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1992

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-77343-X

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: **PATRICIA MARY ANDREWS**

TITLE OF THESIS: **THE COMPLEXITIES SURROUNDING THE QUEST FOR FATHERHOOD IN "THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV"**

DEGREE: **MASTER OF ARTS IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE**

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: **1992**

PERMISSION IS HEREBY GRANTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY TO REPRODUCE SINGLE COPIES OF THIS THESIS AND TO LEND OR SELL SUCH COPIES FOR PRIVATE, SCHOLARLY OR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

THE AUTHOR RESERVES ALL OTHER PUBLICATION AND OTHER RIGHTS IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE COPYRIGHT IN THE THESIS, AND EXCEPT AS HEREINBEFORE PROVIDED NEITHER THE THESIS NOR ANY SUBSTANTIAL PORTION THEREOF MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED IN ANY MATERIAL FORM WHATEVER WITHOUT THE AUTHOR'S PRIOR WRITTEN PERMISSION.

Patricia M. Andrews

Box 106, Clarke's Beach,
Nfld., Canada, A0A 1W0

DATE: October 9, 1992

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THEY HAVE READ, AND RECOMMEND TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH FOR ACCEPTANCE, A THESIS ENTITLED **THE COMPLEXITIES SURROUNDING THE QUEST FOR FATHERHOOD IN 'THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV'** SUBMITTED BY PATRICIA ANDREWS IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF **MASTER OF ARTS IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE.**

Robert Busch,
supervisor

Milan Dimić

Peter Rolland

DATE: September 21, 1992

DEDICATION

To my mother, without whose constant support during the past year (both academic and non-academic), this thesis would never have been completed.

To James, who has given me, and who continues to give me, the joy of being able to call him my father.

To Dr. Yuri Glazov, Professor of Russian at Dalhousie University, who first introduced me to the rich world of Russian Literature, and who incited in me the passion for Dostoevsky.

ABSTRACT

Dostoevsky's ability to bring contrasting genres, plot elements and ideologies together into a unified work of art consists in the freedom he gives his characters to act and to speak without outside interference. Through the extensive use of point and counterpoint, assorted themes and thematic variations are placed side by side and advanced to a crescendo. The result is a polyphonic-like fusion of the diverse elements of the Dostoevskian novel into a basic whole.

In this study, within the framework of polyphony, as described by Mikhail Bakhtin, I show how The Brothers Karamazov coheres around the theme of fatherhood and examine the levels on which this theme is expressed.

First, what is revealed to be a two-fold theme of fatherhood is shown to exist most practically at the level of plot. The causal interactions and dynamics that take place in praxis between the Karamazov brothers and the principal human father figures in the novel mirror the higher manifestation of this theme, namely, the ambivalent attitude that each brother exhibits toward God, understood as the divine father. At the same time, the thematic elements that link the two dimensions of the fatherhood theme are foregrounded for the reader by the novel's architectonics.

Second, the theme of fatherhood is discussed as it is represented dialogically, through an examination of the inner path that each legitimate brother follows (whether consciously or

unconsciously) toward a revelation about divine fatherhood. Their respective paths are both provoked and foregrounded by the relationships which they form with human father figures in the novel and by other characters who mirror their thoughts and actions by verbal and situational echoing.

Finally, the indirect ideological debate between Ivan, who argues against God, and Zosima, who presents the Christian religion as he perceives it to be the answer to man's search for truth, expresses the theme of fatherhood at its highest level of abstraction. The Brothers Karamazov is shown to be **unified** around the theme of fatherhood, for the problems Ivan raises and the answers Zosima provides are seen to have also been extensively addressed at the level of plot and at the level of dialogue throughout the novel, wherein they achieve their resolution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my most sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Robert Busch. To mention all the ways in which Dr. Busch has been instrumental to this thesis would not be possible. Especially, however, I wish to acknowledge the scholarly direction and advice that he has provided during the past year, the immense amount of time which he was always willing to devote to assisting me with this work, and the patience and support that he continually showed, and which has been a great source of encouragement to me at times when I did not think I could finish.

Also, I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Dimic and Dr. Rolland, for taking the time to serve on my committee and for their careful and scholarly review of this thesis.

As well, I would like to thank my Department, especially Doreen, Janet and Jean, and my friends in Edmonton, for the encouragement and support that all these people have given me at the most difficult times during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

THE THEMATIC FOCUS OF THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV IN LIGHT OF DOSTOEVSKY'S POETICS _____ 1

CHAPTER 2

THE ROLE OF PLOT IN THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV ____ 20

CHAPTER 3

DISCOURSE AND MIRRORING IN THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV _____ 78

CHAPTER 4

THE GREAT 'DEBATE' _____134

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS _____155

BIBLIOGRAPHY _____167

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

THE THEMATIC FOCUS OF THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV IN LIGHT OF DOSTOEVSKY'S POETICS

I

General Problems of Interpreting Dostoevsky's Novels

According to Leonid Grossman, the uniqueness of Dostoevsky's art consists in the novelist's ability to merge contrasting genres and starkly heterogeneous material while, at the same time, maintaining an integral and unified work of art. He writes:

> The Book of Job, the Revelation of St. John, the New Testament texts, ... and everything that feeds the pages of Dostoevsky's novels and lends the tone to one or another of their chapters is combined here in a unique way with the newspaper page, the anecdote, the parody, the street scene, the grotesque, and even the pamphlet.[1]

These incompatible narrative elements, he argues, are able to be held together through the unity of Dostoevsky's 'philosophical plan' (философский замысел) and the 'whirlwind movement of events' (вихревое движение событий).

Mikhail Bakhtin, however, takes issue with Grossman on this point. While Dostoevsky's uniqueness is to be found in part in the blending of heterogeneous material and styles, a unified

---

[1] Л. Гроссман, Поэтика Достоевского , (Москва: Государственная Академия Художественных Наук:1925), стр. 175. The English translation has been quoted from: M. Bakhtin, trans. R. W. Rotsel, Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1973), p.11.

philosophical plan and the establishment of whirlwind action are not enough to hold together all the contrasting elements described by Grossman. First of all, if a unified philosophical plan, orchestrated from out of Dostoevsky's personal world-view, were to define and organize the heterogeneous material, then the Dostoevskian novel would be essentially monologic; that is, one would find here only a single finalizing voice: the author's, spoken both directly as narration and indirectly through the voices of certain characters. But, Bakhtin asserts, the unique quality of Dostoevsky's works, and his ability to unify what is contradictory in form and content, lies in the fact that his novels are fundamentally dialogized. With their own personal voices, his characters speak – agree and disagree – with each other, with themselves, and, as well, with the reader and the chronicler. Bakhtin writes:

> Dostoevsky, like Goethe's Prometheus, creates not voiceless slaves (as does Zeus), but rather *free* people who are capable of standing *beside* their creator, of disagreeing with him, and even of rebelling against him.[2]

Secondly, if the monologic authorial voice were to pervade the Dostoevskian novel, in which contradictory material is contained, "then the task of joining the incompatible would not have been solved and Dostoevsky would be an inferior, styleless artist."[3] Finally, the chaotic and rapid movement of events is neither unique to Dostoevsky, nor is it presented in an extreme form in his works.

---

[2] Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, p.4.

[3] Ibid, p.12.

Still, action in Dostoevsky's novels does have a particular whirlwind quality. Inherent in his novels, where truth emerges from dialogue, from the relationships and interactions which take place among the living voices of the characters, is a world that fundamentally exists in the eternal present - a solely spatial world. This condition, Bakhtin says, explains Dostoevsky's tendency "to concentrate in a split second the greatest possible qualitative diversity."[4] The whirlwind aspect of movement, therefore, is a result of the author's attitude toward his characters – not a device specifically used to create unity, as Grossman believed. Rather, a profound unity, more complex than that of a monologic work, results from the multiplicity of essentially independent voices which characterize Dostoevsky's dialogic novels. Analogously, one might compare the monologic harmony of Handel's *Oratorios*, achieved by a variety of instruments producing the same or a complementary melody, to the often discordant and contrasting melodies and styles which Mozart combines to produce his symphonies. Indeed, borrowing from music, Bakhtin describes the Dostoevskian novel as polyphonic – a literary polyphony.[5]

Clearly, the heterogeneous nature of Dostoevsky's novels does not exist solely on the level of narration and style. It has already been mentioned that Dostoevsky allows his characters to be free. He is more concerned with describing how the world

---

[4] Ibid, P.24.
[5] Ibid, p.18.

appears to them, than with how they appear to the world.[6] Each important character is often both self-conscious, as he 'dialogues' with himself, and the personification of an ideology, his view of the world.[7] Therefore, given the diversity of Dostoevsky's individual characters, one also finds in his works, apart from heterogeneous narration and styles, a multiplicity of contradictory voices and ideologies, which reflect the heated issues, debates and problems preoccupying nineteenth century man.

Unfortunately, this elaborate structure is often misunderstood by critics who, despite Bakhtin's enormous contribution to the study of Dostoevsky's poetics, continue to attribute to Dostoevsky positions which tend to reflect the particular bias of their own standpoints. Jones states:

> Dostoevsky is often regarded in the West as a precursor of existentialism, or of Freudian and post-Freudian psychology, or as a prophet of totalitarianism, or as a great religious thinker, as well as an eminent writer of fiction. In Eastern Europe, however, he tends to be regarded above all as a great humanist novelist with a deep interest in social injustice and suffering.[8]

Certainly, there are grounds to encourage each of these interpretations. For example, Dostoevsky's Kirillov and Ivan Karamazov are precursors of existentialism, and even represent an extreme form of this philosophy in the rejection of God and the resurrection of the self as the ultimate authority. Kirillov believes

---

[6] In this respect, one might add that Dostoevsky is also relatively unconcerned with how the world is conventionally perceived.

[7] Ibid, p.63.

[8] Malcolm Jones, Dostoevsky: The Novel of Discord, (London: Elek Books Ltd., 1976), p.12.

that man created God to explain and confront both suffering and the fear of death. According to his view, man must realize that this anguish is only a temporary state of humanity. As such, belief in God's existence is not only false, but impedes any movement to a truly free state of man-godhood where there is neither pain nor fear of death.[9]

In still another narration on man's preeminence, Ivan Karamazov opts to reject God's offer of salvation because the truth on which it is based includes the suffering of innocent children. He says to Alyosha that, out of love for mankind, he is hastening to return his ticket to heaven, *even if he is wrong.* (II, v, 4, стр. 266)[10]

Freudian theory also seems to find a basis in Dostoevsky's works. Sigmund Freud, the founder of psycho-analysis, was the first to research seriously the function of the unconscious mind within the human psyche. In Dostoevsky's novels, dreams play an extremely important role in helping to elucidate the mental state of the dreamer. Moreover, the deeply psychological portrayal of the mental condition of the underground man, Raskolnikov, and other highly disturbed characters anticipates Freudian thought. Furthermore, such themes as the relation between adult mental disturbance and infancy, the inner and outer expression of

---

9 K. Mochulsky, trans. M. Minihan, Dostoevsky: His Life and Work, (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1976), p.449.

10 Ф. Достоевский, Братья Карамазовы , (Москва: Художественная Литература, 1988), стр.266. Henceforth, all quotations from The Brothers Karamazov will be cited parenthetically according to Part, Book, Chapter and page number from this edition.

aggression through masochism, on the one hand, and suicide or murder, on the other, and the phenomenon of the double or multiple personality which Dostoevsky explored have also been popular areas of research for Freud and post-Freudian psychologists.

At the same time, from a strictly ideological perspective, some of Dostoevsky's works may be said to issue a clear warning of the advent of totalitarianism. For example, The Devils, according to Grossman, "is a political satire against the revolutionary movement,"[11] whose leaders are depicted as atheistic, anarchic autocrats. The harsh reality of a totalitarian system which would follow the success of the revolution, is further suggested in the celebrated chapter of The Brothers Karamazov, "Великий инквизитор".

As well, there are those critics who have placed Dostoevsky among the great religious thinkers of all time. His illustration of the spiritual torment of the soul caught between a heart which longs for faith and a mind which cannot believe, and the intense theological debates found in his works possess a truly remarkable depth of insight and profundity.

Finally, those who assert that Dostoevsky is, above all, a great humanist socialist may find expression of this bias in his depiction of the humiliated and the injured, as well as in the underlying idea that 'everyone is responsible for everyone else and for everything'. It is ironic, however, that this principle of

---

[11] L. Grossman, Dostoevsky: A Biography, trans. M. Mackler, (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc, 1975), p.479.

universal responsibility was embodied by the very characters who most opposed the atheist socialism, toward which agnostic humanism logically tends. These were Dostoevsky's Christ-like figures: Myshkin, Zosima and Alyosha, who believed that true Christianity was to be found only among a universal brotherhood of man.

Indeed, one can find support for each of the interpretations which Jones mentions – existentialist, Freudian, totalitarian, religious or humanitarian. However, since defining any of these as the underlying basis of Dostoevsky's work is both to assume the presence of a monologic authorial voice and to ignore obvious incompatibilities and mutual inconsistencies which occur among them, it is evident that any ideology which would attempt to be exclusive and all encompassing could not possibly be the underlying premise of his art.

In treating Dostoevsky's works, one must be exceedingly careful not to allow personal biases to intrude. For, indeed, if the critic expects to find in this author arguments for a particular system of thought or view on life, he will likely find it. Such an approach to Dostoevsky, however, undermines the whole polyphonic system on which his art is founded. Therefore, even if the assumption which the biased critic makes were to contain some element of partial truth, it has no more validity than a statement which is entirely false because his position has not been formed out of and tested by an understanding of the full implications of the structure of the work. Clearly, by approaching the interpretation of Dostoevsky on the basis of biased

assumptions, the critic demonstrates that he has misunderstood the multi-voiced nature of the artist's novels.

The fragmentation which results from Dostoevsky's use of polyphony, where many independent and relatively equal voices are heard, Grossman argues, expresses the author's own "horrified vision of the complete disintegration, disruption and decomposition of the great whole."[12] However, one must not conclude from this fragmentation that the raison d'être of his art is purely to illustrate the disintegration of the old world order and the character of the anarchic, nihilistic society which was being proposed as its replacement. Certainly Dostoevsky wished to express this reality, but so as to be able both to warn his readers of the true character of the new society which was taking shape, and at the same time to reveal a way out of the resulting chaos. Indeed, Grossman writes that despite the darkness and destruction Dostoevsky depicted, he "is a lighted torch."[13] Consequently, the critic should not allow himself to become so disoriented by the author's heteroglossia that he concludes that Dostoevsky's novels are ultimately meaningless. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Dostoevsky's thought is most clearly revealed in the polyphonic novel, where form is so very tightly intertwined with content. Still, it must be admitted that the inherent fragmentation and the difficulty the reader experiences in arriving at a sense of unity makes the task of the critic, searching for a comprehensive

---

[12] Ibid, p.591.
[13] Ibid, p.575.

interpretation of Dostoevsky's art, especially difficult. The critic must approach the work impartially and without prejudice, allowing the complex structure of the work its full effect. One must allow himself to be both reader of and listener to the many voices of the Dostoevskian novel if he is to discover the heart of Dostoevsky's art and the thought it expresses.

II

The Poetics of The Brothers Karamazov and the Theme of Fatherhood

In November, 1880, less than two months before Dostoevsky's death, the last part of The Brothers Karamazov was published. This novel marked the summit and, arguably, the completion of the whole of his life-work. For example, Grossman writes: "Dostoevsky created toward the end of his life a monumental novel resembling a choral tragedy, a multi-voiced yet harmonious epilogue to all his turbulent work."[14] While the tragic nature of this work could well be contested, there can be no disagreement as to its elaborate multi-voiced structure. Furthermore, The Brothers Karamazov may, in a general sense, properly be classified as an epilogue, not only as the last novel written by Dostoevsky, but also according to the more precise definition of epilogue: the final part of a work which contains and completes that which precedes it. The distinguishing features of

---

[14] Ibid, 593.

literary art with which Dostoevsky experimented in varying degrees in his previous novels are brought to their completion in The Brothers Karamazov, a seemingly discordant and yet at the same time profoundly unified work of art. These features involve, for example:

1) the freedom and independence of the voices and actions of the characters,[15]

2) the blending of heterogeneous voices, styles and ideologies, and

3) the personification and sharp counterpoint of intense ideological struggles.

This last novel is undoubtedly the most complex, and the most brilliant of all of Dostoevsky's works.

In Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, Bakhtin writes: "The unity of the polyphonic novel which stands above the word, above the voice, above the accent remains undiscovered."[16] One might expect that Bakhtin intended to uncover this unity throughout the course of his study. However, in this work, he does not disclose the unity underlying Dostoevksy's thought, but rather he provides a system – based on the polyphonic intertwining of relatively independent voices – through which one may systematically approach an interpretation of Dostoevsky's art. As such, Bakhtin's statement is to be read as a challenge to the interpreter of

---

[15] The independence which the characters exhibit is clearly only relative in that, as author, Dostoevsky is ultimately the creator of his characters and of the voices which they speak. However, in the sense that he neither colors the voices of his characters with his own voice nor has them act in a manner which specifically foregrounds his personal views, the voices and actions of the characters may be said to possess a certain freedom *within the realm of the novel per se.*

[16] Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, p.37.

Dostoevsky. Through an examination of The Brothers Karamazov in light of the distinguishing aspects of its architectonics, which both allow for and necessitate the polyphonic system expounded by Mikhail Bakhtin, one may perhaps discover the unity, the 'idea', at the heart of Dostoevsky's thought, which for so long has either been neglected or misunderstood by critics.

The above outlined features of Dostoevsky's art which culminate in The Brothers Karamazov have their origins, Bakhtin argues, in the ancient literary realm of the 'serio-comical' – in particular, in the Socratic Dialogue and the Menippean Satire.

The first characteristic – the freedom and independence of the voices and actions of the characters – stems most from the Socratic Dialogue. Here "truth is not born and does not reside in the head of an individual person; it is born of the dialogical intercourse *between people* in the collective search for truth."[17] Despite the fact that Socrates orchestrates the dialogue, he does not claim to *know* the truth. The oracle at Delphi says of him that he is the wisest man alive because he alone knows that he knows nothing. Rather, Socrates assumes a position of 'midwife' for the truth: "He brought people together and caused them to collide in a dispute, as a result of which the truth was born."[18] The two basic devices that he uses to encourage dialogue are syncrisis – 'the juxtaposition of various points of view toward a given object', and anacrisis – 'the means of eliciting and provoking the words of one's interlocutor, forcing him to express his opinion and express

---

[17] Ibid. p.90.
[18] Ibid.

it fully'; "the provocation of the word by the word."[19] The participants of the Socratic Dialogue are free to express their own opinions, to agree or disagree with the other participants and with Socrates himself, the leader of the discussion. For his part, Dostoevsky, as author, assumes a role analogous to Socrates: through the use of verbal syncrisis and anacrisis, he draws his characters into dialogue with one another, allowing them to express their own opinions and to live out their unique lives as characters in the novel, essentially independent of outside control. Dostoevsky is like the director in a *living* drama: as Morson states it:

> he begins with a perception of distinct and autonomous personalities (or voices), and the positing of a set of potential conflicts within and among them. A situation is then created to provoke the characters into maximal self-revelation and development, but the direction of the action is not, and should not be, clearly seen.[20]

For its part, the ancient Menippea is partially reflected in the clashes which inevitably result from the free reign of these individualized voices. The celebration of diversity is at the heart of this ancient genre. As such, although the previously mentioned counterpoint of discordant voices is certainly present in the Menippea, its influence on Dostoevsky is most clearly revealed in the novelist's propensity to bring together a variety of contrasting genres and ideologies – the second trait which distinguishes his art.

---

[19] Ibid, p.91.

[20] Gary Saul Morson, "The Baxtin Industry," Slavic and East European Journal, vol.30 (1986), p.83.

Dostoevsky's emphasis on contrariety, and the mixing of the unmixable, which underlies most of the essential characteristics of the Menippea, also has its root in a still older tradition: the carnival. Michael Holquist, in his article entitled "The Carnival of Discourse: Bakhtin and Simultaneity," writes: "If the state's symbol is the uniform that turns the whole body of its wearer into an unambiguous sign of rank, then carnival's symbol is the mask and the costume that decertify identity and enable transformation."[21] Hierarchical boundaries – social, cultural, religious, etc. – which separate people are suspended. During the carnival, man interrelates with man regardless of age, culture, or social status. As a consequence of the unrestricted familiar attitude which pervades the carnival, one finds there, and in 'carnivalized' literature, the admixture of every kind of material, however shocking or inappropriate according to ordinary societal conventions: "the sacred with the profane, the lofty with the lowly, the great with the insignificant, the wise with the stupid, etc."[22] Dostoevsky's extensive use of counterpoint both brings together people from opposing and 'inappropriate' backgrounds, and also allows for the fusion of contradictory genres, styles and ideologies. Thus, Dostoevsky not only suspends the ordinary rules of society, but he takes carnival's principle of mésalliance to its extreme in the suspension of the conventions of literature as well.

---

21 Michael Holquist, "The Carnival of Discourse: Bakhtin and Simultaneity," Canadian Review of Comparative Literature, vol.12 (1985), p.222.

22 Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, p.101.

The third distinguishing feature of Dostoevsky's art – the personification and sharp counterpoint of intense ideological struggles – arises from the Socratic Dialogue and the Menippean Satire. In the Socratic Dialogue, each of the speakers is an 'ideologist'. "The dialogical testing of the idea is simultaneously a testing of the person who represents it."[23] The truth of the ideological quest and the truth of the individual can be seen as the same, because the idea is embodied, personified by the speaker. As such the contrapuntal ideological struggles which ensue, both in Socratic Dialogue and in Dostoevsky's fiction, take on an intensity and an immediacy appropriate to that which characterizes deeply personal conflicts between living people. The Menippean Satire also seeks to test the personalized idea. However, where, in the Socratic Dialogue, the emphasis is on the idea from a theoretical perspective – the idea is embodied essentially so that its abstract meaning may be more easily seen – Menippea's concern is the practical solution of the idea in the world. Thus, ideological struggles, in Dostoevsky's works, exhibit an urgency and a deeply personal nature because they are embodied by independent, willful personalities and because they concern the most essential problems – the 'ultimate questions' – surrounding human existence.

The idea that truth is to be born out of the bringing together of contrariety, which is represented in the Socratic Dialogue and in the Menippean Satire, is also espoused by

---

[23] Ibid, p.92.

carnival. While Socrates directs his pupils toward truth by allowing them to voice their opinions fully and then by leading them to an awareness of the contradictions inherent in these views, the Menippean Satire searches for the truth of man in society by combining heterogeneous material of all sorts – the godly with the profane, the wise man with the fool, the rich man with the beggar, etc. In a similar manner, the carnival, as Holquist expresses it, "is a way cultural systems come to know themselves by playing at being different."[24] If ideologies become personalities, then the counterpoint which brings conflicting ideologies into dialogue with one another, is also the playing off of opposing personalities, or, in some cases, the dialogue between two warring sides of a split personality. Dialogic interaction, the anticipation of and response to voices or ideologies, which are other than one's own, can only take place if one recognizes, that is, considers, the other voices or ideologies as if they were one's own. Consequently, one might say that the truth underlying these ideological debates, including the debates between persons, is indeed revealed in the spirit of carnival: by 'playing at being different'.

The aforementioned three distinguishing features of Dostoevsky's art – the freedom of the voices and actions of the characters, the blending of heterogeneous material, and the personification of intense ideological struggles – can not be separated from one another. Taken individually, none of these

---

[24] "The Carnival of Discourse: Baxtin and Simultaneity," p.230.

features is especially unique. Each has as its source genres within the ancient realm of the serio-comical. Rather, their collective uniqueness lies in the fact that Dostoevsky brought them together in the unity of the polyphonic novel. But, as Bakhtin emphasized, this unity stands of necessity above the word, that is, above any singly expressed, monologic ideology.

The Brothers Karamazov is, indeed, perhaps the most complete example of the polyphonic novel.[25] The ideological dilemmas concerning 'ultimate questions', exist as dialogic struggles between and within individuals, where the truth of the ideological question and the truth of the individual are inextricably linked. At the same time, the heterogeneous mixture of the contradictory material of the plot is placed within the novel to 'provoke the word', to provoke ideological debate and therefore facilitate a revelation of the truth for which the characters are searching. Consequently, since the whole architectonics of the work has been designed to enhance the issues involved in the character's attempt to solve the ultimate questions of life, the idea that is contained in the answer to these problems – a truth which the characters freely discover – is to be found through an examination of the various levels on which the ideological debate is expressed polyphonically.

In a broad sense, a unifying theme of The Brothers Karamazov is the search for fatherhood.[26] At the ideological level,

---

[25] Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, p.34.

[26] Victor Amend, "Theme and Form in 'The Brothers Karamazov'", Modern Fiction Studies, vol.3-4 (1957-1959), p.240-241.

the 'ultimate question' asked, the truth of which is also the truth of Dostoevsky's individual characters, as well as the truth of the world, is the question of the existence of God or, in Orthodox Christian terms, God the Father.[27] In a letter to his friend Apollon Maikov, Dostoevsky writes the following concerning The Brothers Karamazov:

> Главный вопрос, который проведется во всех частях - тот самый, которым я мучился сознательно и бессознательно всю мою жизнь - (это) существование Божие.[28]

The problem of the existence of God, or, more generally, the simultaneous search for and rejection of fatherhood, is embodied on a variety of different levels in The Brothers Karamazov. The most practical representation of the ideological struggle is provided at the level of plot. Although the central events of the novel are designed by the author, the characters are free to discover *or not to discover* whatever may be the truth of

---

[27] 1) Often, throughout this thesis I refer to God as 'the Divine Father' or as 'God the Father'. I have done so, not to express my own opinion, but to illustrate the theme of fatherhood: through parallelism involving both theme and plot, God is very much implied as a father figure in the novel. 2) Given the potential controversy regarding the use of 'inclusive language' to denote God, my use of the masculine gender deserves clarification. When I refer to God as a 'father', I am writing, as noted above, within the framework of the novel itself. Moreover, the notion of God as a father accords with the Christian Orthodox tradition; for example, the 'Lord's Prayer' begins with the phrase: "Отче наш, и же еси на небесах..." Furthermore, my use of the masculine pronoun 'he' to refer to God is appropriate in that I speak of God as he is perceived during the period in which the novel was written, i.e., in the nineteenth century, when the pronoun he [он], although grammatically masculine, denoted a being which ultimately transcends human gender distinctions. In this regard, one might recall for instance how Alyosha's mother had prayed to the *divine mother* of God to protect her son.

[28] Ф.М. Достоевский, Письма II, 1867-1871, (Москва: Государственное Издательство,1930), стр. 263.

the ideological question. That is, as Morson points out, Dostoevsky creates a series of situations or events in order to provoke dialogue between the characters concerning faith in God the Father and atheism, so that the truth underlying this dilemma may be discovered the only way possible: through the dialogue of polyphonic relationships. In the second chapter of this thesis, I will consider the manner in which the search for fatherhood is expressed at the level of plot. At the same time, I will show how the situations and events created prompt the intense ideological struggle concerning faith, which is to be personalized and freely embodied by the characters in the novel.

The stage having been set, the central drama, as it were, begins in earnest with the dialogical interaction between the characters. Each of the three legitimate Karamazov brothers, as an image of an ideological stand concerning the question of God's existence, and as a personality seeking to understand himself and the world in which he lives through the dialogic interaction of his own voice with the voices of others, participates directly in the search for fatherhood. The parodic doubles of these three Karamazovs mirror the dialogue which occurs between the brothers themselves and the other major characters of the novel. As well, the urgency and the intensity of the ideological 'debate' are enhanced through the more subtle type of dialogic interaction which takes place directly between the legitimate brothers and their parodic doubles, who in a few cases represent the split sides of the major characters. Therefore, in chapter three, I will discuss the manner in which the issues involved in the theme of

fatherhood are expressed at the level of dialogue through the polyphonic structure that is created by the interactions which connect the brothers, their doubles and the other main characters.

The high-point of the theme of fatherhood is the ideological 'debate' that takes place between Ivan, who in the latter part of Book Five describes his rationale for the intellectual rejection of God and Christ, and Zosima, who in Chapters Two and Three of the following Book presents the Christian religion, as he perceives it, to be the answer to man's search for truth.[29] In Books Five and Six, the arguments for and against faith in God, and the depth of the dichotomy between belief and doubt are presented with the greatest force and the greatest sense of urgency. In chapter four of this thesis, then, I will treat the specific features of this indirect 'debate' which takes place between Ivan and Zosima. Through a consideration of the novel in light of the arguments raised by both men, what would otherwise appear to be a largely fragmented, meaningless mixture of events and dialogic interactions crystalizes into a profound unity. The idea underlying this unity is not monologic, as critics of the past believed. Rather, the characters freely discover it as the only viable solution to their search for fatherhood.

---

[29] Zosima's perspective, while rooted in Eastern Orthodoxy, may be seen as somewhat heterodoxical within the Orthodox tradition.

CHAPTER 2: THE ROLE OF PLOT IN THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV

The ideological debate over faith and the rejection of God the Father, which is the heart of the theme of fatherhood and, indeed, the high-point of The Brothers Karamazov, is given practical application at the level of plot.

Given the complex nature of the novel's plot, a time line illustrating for the reader the relation between time and narrative incident will be provided before directly discussing the embodiment of the theme of fatherhood at this level. The causal movement of events and the structural principles Dostoevsky employed to create his polyphonic novel – both aspects of plot which will be dealt with later in this chapter – inhere in this time line.

In June, 1878, while en route to the Optina Pustyn Monastery, Dostoevsky discussed with Solovyov the plans for his new novel, The Brothers Karamazov. By July of the same year, the novel had already been well begun.[30] Therefore, when Dostoevsky's authorial persona writes that the novel takes place thirteen years ago (От автора, стр. 4), one can infer that the action begins approximately in the mid-1860s. More specifically, Grossman argues that the present time is 1866 because it was only in April of this year that trial by jury, which Dmitry undergoes, was introduced in Russia.

---

[30] Dostoevsky: A Biography, pp.574-575.

Assuming, then, that the action and events which occur within the present time of the novel begin in 1866, the following time frame may be deduced.

I

Book One: "История одной семейки"

Book One, which recounts events that took place prior to the narrative present, is not organized chronologically, but thematically, as is explained later in the ensuing section on 'structural plot'. However, a clear time frame of past events can be deduced from the information provided by the chronicler.

1838 Dmitry is born; there is no indication as to when Fyodor Pavlovich married Adelaida, Dmitry's mother.

1841 Adelaida runs off with a divinity student, leaving her three-year-old son, Dmitry, with Fyodor Pavlovich; Gregory takes the child under his care.

1842 Dmitry, now four, goes to live with Miusov; Fyodor Pavlovich marries Sophia; Smerdyakov is born.

1843 Ivan is born from the second marriage.

1846 Alyosha is born.

1849 Sophia dies; three months later Ivan and Dmitry go to live with the widow of General Vorokhov, their mother's former benefactress.

1865 Alyosha, who had recently returned to Skotoprigonievsk (his father's town), meets Father Zosima and asks for his father's permission to enter the monastery. Most likely, it is at this time that Ivan publishes his controversial article on the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts.

Late June, 1866

Ivan arrives in Skotoprigonievsk. It is not clear when Dmitry comes to the town, except that it is after Ivan. Shortly after Dmitry's arrival, a meeting, to be held at the monastery in the Elder Zosima's cell, is planned to settle a money dispute that has arisen between Fyodor Pavlovich and Dmitry.

I I

In Book Two the events that occur during the narrative present begin with the meeting of the Karamazovs at the monastery.

A) LATE AUGUST, 1866

Day 1

11:30-1:00

The Karamazov's meet at the monastery [I, ii ("Неуместное собрание"),1-8].

Flashback twenty four years to 1842 – the birth of Smerdyakov to Lizaveta and introduction of the servants Gregory and Martha [I, iii ("Сладострастники"),1-2].

Early afternoon

Alyosha and Dmitry meet; Dmitry confesses his cruel behavior toward his fiancée, Katerina, his passion for Grushenka, and as well he expresses his desire for God [I, iii, 3-5].

Late afternoon to early evening

Dmitry attacks his father, promising to kill him the next time [I, iii, 6-9].

Night

On his way back to the monastery, Alyosha meets Dmitry a second time; in a highly excited, unstable state, Dmitry again declares his love for Grushenka and, striking his breast, confesses that he is about to do something very dishonorable and disgraceful [I, iii,11].

Day 2

10:00 1) Dmitry goes to Samsonov's; 2) Dmitry goes to a pawn shop to pawn his watch; 3) Dmitry then leaves for Ilyinskoye Village to see Gorstkin [all events: III, viii (Митя),1].

Noon Alyosha witnesses a rock-throwing fight between Ilyusha and a group of other school boys [II, iv, 3].

Afternoon

1) Alyosha and Lize decide to marry [II, v (Pro and Contra),1]; 2) Ivan and Alyosha meet in the tavern where Ivan relates his legend "Великий Инквизитор" [II, v, 3-5]; 3) Smerdyakov draws Ivan covertly into a plot to murder Fyodor Pavlovich [II, v, 6].

'Digression' from action

Alyosha's account of the life and teachings of Father Zosima describes events which occur in the past, and therefore outside the time of the novel proper; this account was reported to have been written by Alyosha two days after the elder's death [II, vi ("Русский инок")].

Night

Dmitry arrives in Ilyinskoye [III, viii, 3].

Day 3

Early Morning

Father Zosima dies [II, vi, 3].

8:00 Ivan sets out for Volovya station to travel to Chermashnaya, but changes his mind and decides instead to go on to Moscow [II, v, 7]

10:00

Smerdyakov pretends to have an epileptic attack [II, v, 7].

Afternoon

Dmitry returns to Skotoprigonievsk and accompanies Grushenka to Samsonov's [III, viii, 3].

Between 5:00 and 6:00

Dmitry pawns his pistols to Peter Perkhotin for ten roubles [III, viii, 3].

7:30 1) Dmitry visits Mrs. Khokhlakov in the hope of getting a loan of three thousand roubles [III, viii, 3]; 2) Rakitin and Alyosha visit Grushenka; Grushenka leaves for Mokroye to visit her former Polish lover [III, vii, 3]; 3) fifteen minutes later Dmitry arrives at Grushenka's, is enraged

that she is not there, grabs a pestle and leaves [III, viii, 3]; 4) Gregory is incapacitated due to a back spasm [II, v, 7].

Between 7:45 and 8:00

1) Dmitry goes to his father's place and assaults Gregory with the pestle; 2) Fyodor Pavlovich is murdered [both events: III, viii, 4].

8:00-8:20

Dmitry returns to Grushenka's to find out where she had gone [III, viii, 5).

8:30 1) Dmitry returns to Perkhotin's to get his pistols [III, viii, 5); 2) Dmitry sets out for Mokroye [III, viii, 5).

9:30 Dmitry arrives in Mokroye [III, viii, 6).[31]

10:30

Perkhotin goes to see Fenya [III, viii, 6).

11:00 Perkhotin visits Mrs. Khokhlakov, and then goes to inform Inspector Makarov about Dmitry's odd behavior and the possible murder of Fyodor Pavlovich [III, ix (Предварительное следствие),1].

Flashback to the time of the murder

In Chapter Two of Book Nine, events following the murder are described: 1) five minutes before Perkhotin arrives at Inspector Makarov's, Foma, Martha and Maria discover the body of Fyodor Pavlovich and inform the Inspector; 2) the Inspector, the Prosecutor, the Examining Magistrate, and the women go to inform the Assistant Police Inspector; 3) following the meeting with the Police Inspector, the officials leave for Mokroye to apprehend Dmitry.

Day 4

Early Morning

Through the early morning hours Dmitry is questioned at length and then arrested for the murder of Fyodor Pavlovich [III, ix, 3-9].

B) EARLY NOVEMBER: PASSAGE OF TIME – APPROXIMATELY TWO AND A HALF MONTHS

7 Days Before The Trial

Morning

Ivan visits Lize [IV, xi, 2].

1 Day Before The Trial

Between 11:30 and 12:00

Alyosha and the thirteen year old Kolya meet for the first time; Alyosha and the boys gather at Ilyusha's bedside [IV, x (Мальчики), 3-7].

Afternoon

Alyosha goes to see Grushenka [IV, xi (Брат Иван Фёдорович), 1]; Alyosha visits Lize and Mrs. Khokhlakov; Lize is revealed to be deeply

---

[31] Henceforth, I have used italics when the time given is an approximation.

disturbed by an unhealthy attraction to evil which is linked with Ivan [IV, xi, 2].

Evening

1) Alyosha visits Dmitry in prison; Dmitry discloses that Rakitin, Ivan's mirror character, has also been visiting him in an attempt to weaken Dmitry's new faith in God [IV, xi, 4]; 2) Alyosha and Ivan meet at Katerina's, where the latter is revealed to be tormented by the murder and by his own feeling of guilt [IV, xi, 5].

Flashback to events between the murder and the present time

1) Five days after Fyodor Pavlovich's death Ivan returns from Moscow. He visits first Dmitry, then Smerdyakov [IV, xi, 6]; 2) two weeks later, and about six weeks before the trial, Ivan visits Smerdyakov for the second time after the murder. He then visits Katerina who shows him a letter from Dmitry which strongly suggests that Dmitry is the murderer [IV, xi, 7].

Evening before the trial

Following the meeting with Alyosha described in Chapter Five, Ivan visits Smerdyakov for the third time where he learns that Smerdyakov is the murderer and that he himself served as the 'masterminding' accomplice [IV, xi, 8].

Night

1) Delerious, Ivan has a vision of the devil; Smerdyakov commits suicide [IV, xi, 9]; 2) Alyosha comes to Ivan to inform him of Smerdyakov's suicide [IV, xi,10].

The Day Of The Trial

10:00 - Late evening

The whole of Book Twelve (Судебная ошибка), which covers more than a hundred pages, is devoted to the trial precedings. At the same time, the events described in Book Twelve are compressed within a single day.

2 Days After The Trial

Ilyusha dies [Эпилог, 3].

5 Days After The Trial

Morning

1) Alyosha visits Katerina; the reader learns that Ivan, now gravely ill, has been taken in by Katerina; the plans for Dmitry's escape are discussed [Эпилог, 1]; 2) Alyosha visits Dmitry; Katerina and Grushenka visit Dmitry [Эпилог, 2].

Evening

1) Ilyusha's funeral; 2) the 'speech by the stone' [Эпилог, 3].

In the introduction, I explained, drawing on Bakhtin, that the uniqueness of Dostoevsky's art consists partially in the manner in which his characters are free to express themselves independently of their creator's control. The result is a multi-voiced structure, where truth can only emerge from the interaction of highly autonomous voices, which in some cases agree and in other cases disagree with one another. This structure, Bakhtin argues, is analogous to a musical polyphony where a variety of different, sometimes highly discordant, voices are brought together to produce a unified whole.

However, Dostoevsky's characters are not only free to speak independently of their creator; like people in real life, where the future is unknown and indeterminate, his characters are portrayed as free to move and act. Only those events, which have happened prior to the start of the novel and which are described because they provide the necessary background to the action which unfolds during the actual story time, appear as set by the author. By placing in the past the initial situation which allows for the conflict that follows, and by placing in the present all subsequent actions leading up to and following the principal conflict, the action of the novel appears to the reader as undetermined, and the characters appear to be the sole agents of their actions. That is, to repeat what Morson states, the author creates an initial situation, where a series of conflicts are posited, in order "to provoke the characters into maximal self-revelation and development, but the direction of the action is not, and should

not be, clearly seen."[32] However, by minimizing the determinative weight of the past, the chronicler also underplays his role as narrator, so that the control which he wields over the reader by the order and manner in which he relays the events is not evident. Consequently, and paradoxically, his power to affect the reader, as distinct from the characters, is increased.

Given that the ideological struggle between faith and atheism is waged by characters who, according to the complexities and torments within their own unique personalities, are shown as freely engaging in the debate, and given that these same characters are shown as freely acting and moving in the novel according to the dictates of their passions and their will, it follows, therefore, that the plot in the wider sense – as the causal movement of actions and interactions which form the 'story' – may be seen as exhibiting the same search for and rejection of fatherhood. As such, it actually mirrors the key elements of this conflict which the characters express at the ideological level. Indeed, as in real life, the manner in which a person conducts his life – his actions and his relationships with other people – is an outward expression of his inner being – his thoughts and torments.

The natural correlation between the inner person and his actions is dramatically underscored in The Brothers Karamazov by the short spans of time during which the crucial events of the novel and intense character interactions occur. That is, the actions

---

[32] "The Baxtin Industry", op cit.

of the novel and the dialogues which explicitly reveal the inner thoughts of the speakers are linked both by their contiguity and by their common sense of urgency – which in turn are conditioned by the rapid movement and extreme compression of time.

There is, however, an obvious fundamental distinction between our perception of living people and characters in a novel. In real life, the observer exercises more control over his observation of people, including the order in which he observes them. The reader of a novel, on the other hand, lacks this control. He is not only influenced by the actual events and dialogues which take place, but also by the order and manner in which the story is told. By technical definition, plot encompasses both the causal movement of events in the time and space of the novel – the wider definition of plot, which for clarity I shall refer to as the 'causal plot' – and the creatively manipulative ordering of these events, which heavily influences the reader as he moves from chapter to chapter. This more specific aspect of plot I will refer to as the 'structural plot'.[33] In many novels, the chapters are largely arranged according to the sequential movement of cause and effect, and as such the order in which the story is told is not specifically used as a device to influence the reader. However, Dostoevsky's novels "are not [primarily, P.A.] based on plot in the

---

[33] The manner in which I have defined plot closely resembles the formalist definition of plot, consisting of the 'fabula' – the chronological story-line – and the 'syuzhet' – the order and manner in which events are presented in the novel. However, because I extend the formalist definition of 'fabula' to include the causal motivations of the characters, I have chosen to divide plot according to its causal and structural components instead of according to the 'fabula' and 'syuzhet' of the formalists.

conventional sense of a linear sequence of events combined according to the principle of causality."[34] Rather, just as the complex interplay of independent and often discordant voices in the Dostoevskian novel is commonly likened to a musical polyphony, the structure of his novels and the arrangement of the chapters, with their tightly controlled thematic variations, long digressions, transitions, etc., may also be compared to a polyphony. Jostein Børtnes writes that reading Dostoevsky's novels:

> is like following a theme through its different phases, waiting for its return while following other themes, experiencing their simultaneous presence within the structural whole of the individual novels.[35]

A general unifying theme of The Brothers Karamazov is the quest for fatherhood. As such, the structure of the novel has been designed to foreground for the reader this theme by interweaving the ideological aspect of the theme of fatherhood – the debates and struggles which occur concerning the existence of God the Divine Father – with the physical manifestation of this theme – the actions and interactions which revolve around a human father or father figure.

In this Chapter, I will first consider the movement of events and interactions as they actually occur – the causal plot. At the same time, the conflict surrounding the quest for fatherhood, which appears dialogically at the ideological level, will

---

[34] Jostein Børtnes, "Polyphony in *The Brothers Karamazov* ", Canadian-American Slavic Studies, 17, No.3 (Fall 1983), p.406.
[35] Ibid

be exhibited. Secondly, I will discuss the way in which the theme of fatherhood is foregrounded by the creative ordering of events, the use of point and counterpoint, and by the use of other literary devices – the structural plot. Since it would not be possible to treat this more technical aspect of plot in its entirety in a single chapter, the structural techniques which Dostoevsky employed to create his polyphonic novel will be examined as they are demonstrated at an introductory level in Book One of The Brothers Karamazov – "История одной семейки". The analysis of plot will conclude with a general overview of the polyphonic relationships which, centered around the theme of fatherhood, draw the Books and the Parts of the novel into a unified whole where the discordant is combined with the concordant.

The discussion of the causal plot will deal principally with the characters themselves: the way in which they are situationally provoked into self-revelation by the potential conflicts set at the opening of the novel, and the motivations which provide the causal links in the chain of events that form the story line.

The central event, which provides the *raison d'être* of all the actions and interactions which happen before and after it, is the murder of Fyodor Pavlovich by one of his sons. These sons, for a long time, had considerable reason to harbor hatred and bitterness towards their father – a lecherous, stingy and debauched sensualist – who completely abandoned his children from their infancy.

The action set within the present time of the novel begins when the now adult Karamazov brothers meet for the first time in Skotoprigonievsk. Dmitry, twenty-eight, is an officer in the military; Ivan, five years younger, is an intellectual and an apparent atheist; Alyosha, twenty, is a novice monk under the direction of the revered Elder Zosima; and Smerdyakov, the twenty-four year old illegitimate son of Fyodor Pavlovich, is his father's servant who prides himself as a new man of the sixties.

The principal reason for the boys' return to their father's home is to be found in the initial situation which provokes all the actions and events of the novel, including the parricide. On the surface, this situation is a monetary dispute between the oldest son and his father. According to Dmitry, his father has cheated him out of his full inheritance from his mother and still owes him three thousand roubles. Fyodor Pavlovich, however, maintains that he has already paid his son all that is owed. At the monastery, where the Karamazovs agree to settle the conflict under Father Zosima's guidance, the full nature of the situation is revealed. Not only are the two men in love with the same woman, Grushenka, but Fyodor Pavlovich has promised her three thousand roubles – the exact amount of money which Dmitry says his father owes him – if she will choose him instead of his son. It is this complication that has turned Dmitry into a madman, capable of parricide. Dmitry's desperation and anxiety are further increased by his theft of three thousand roubles – again the same amount of money he believes he is owed – from his fiancée, Katerina, and his desire to repay her this money before starting a

new life with Grushenka. Meanwhile, Ivan is in love with Dmitry's fiancée, and therefore hopes as much as his older brother that Grushenka will choose Dmitry over Fyodor Pavlovich, for only then would a romantic relationship seem possible between Ivan and Katerina.

Just two days after the meeting at the monastery, during which the complications described above are revealed, Fyodor Pavlovich is murdered. Dmitry, with an obvious motive and implicated by more than sufficient circumstantial evidence, is charged. The murder, however, was not committed by Dmitry, but by the cunningly dissimulative Smerdyakov, the servant and, almost certainly, illegitimate son of Fyodor Pavlovich who despised his father for having denied him his place as a son. The material motive for murder is the three thousand roubles which Smerdyakov knows Fyodor Pavlovich has hidden for Grushenka and which will allow him to move to Moscow. However, there exists a more subtle, ideological motive: like Raskolnikov in Crime and Punishment, Smerdyakov kills the old man principally to test an idea. Here, it is Ivan's idea that if there is no immortality then 'all is permitted', including murder for three thousand roubles. At the same time, the ruthless and cunning servant draws the author of this idea, Ivan, into the parricide with him by appealing to the brother's subconscious, demonic side. The implicit understanding between the two is that Ivan, sharing Smerdyakov's loathing for his father and desiring the murder to enhance his own designs on Katerina, intellectually willed the crime and covertly incited his illegitimate brother, while Smerdyakov simply carried out the act.

"Ivan thinks abstractly, Smerdyakov accomplishes the practical conclusion."[36]

At the trial Ivan confesses his, and Smerdyakov's, guilt. But with the only witness who could affirm Ivan's testimony – Smerdyakov himself – dead, Ivan's confession is futile. The jurors – the 'good old peasants', attuned only to the version of reality that is most presentable in the courtroom (that based solely on conventional causality as opposed to the 'higher reality' of the Smerdyakov-Ivan murder plot) – find Dmitry guilty of the murder of his father. As the novel draws to its conclusion, Ivan, haunted by a vision of the devil and an awareness of his own guilt, is reported to be in a state of mental collapse. Dmitry, having undergone the ordeal of a ruthless investigation and ready to assume the responsibility for a crime he did not commit, has a mystical experience in which he dreams of a suffering babe, and somehow, from this dream, is for the first time truly able to take up the cross of Christ.

The link between Ivan's spiritual torment and his guilt in the murder, and the significance of Dmitry's sudden conversion to Christianity can only begin to be understood in light of the spiritual dimension of the murder story – the part of the causal plot which mirrors most directly the same struggle concerning the existence of God which is expressed dialogically at the ideological level. Mochulsky writes: "In The Brothers Karamazov, the

---

[36] Dostoevsky: His life and Work, p.624.

religious mystery-play is paradoxically joined with a crime novel."[37]

At the center of the religious dimension stands Alyosha. Of the four brothers, only this youngest is entirely innocent of any conscious desire to kill his father. Moreover, he is the only brother who begins the novel as a believer in God the Father. Like his other brothers, however, Alyosha also has his torment and his period of spiritual doubt. When Father Zosima dies – less than a day before Fyodor Pavlovich's death – Alyosha, out of misery, finds himself influenced by Ivan's rebellion against God and begins, as well, to question God's justice. However, his rebellion does not last long. Like Dmitry, he has a mystical experience: in a dream, Father Zosima and Jesus appear to him. The comfort of both his spiritual father and the Son of God reaffirms in Alyosha his faith in God's love and justice.

Just as all four brothers exhibit – albeit in highly varying degrees – a rejection of God the Father, there is also a sense in which they all bear responsibility for the death of their biological father. Even Alyosha, who "at the crucial moment forgot to be his brother's keeper,"[38] admits that he too feels the Karamazov drive – that earthly, sensual instinct which was ultimately the cause of the tensions and passions that precipitated the parricide. Furthermore, it is significant that Ivan and Smerdyakov, who are most genuinely and immediately responsible for the death of the

---

[37] Ibid, p.601.

[38] Victor Terras, A Karamazov Companion, (Madison, Wisconsin: The Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1981), p.74.

father, are the only two who remain in rebellion against God, the Divine Father. Clearly, a definite parallel exists between each character's relation to his biological father and his relationship to God. The murder of the physical father symbolizes the intellectual and spiritual rejection of God the Divine Father.

In light of the parallel described above between the physical and the spiritual, Dmitry's conversion to Christianity can be understood as inextricably linked to his basic innocence of the murder. While he may have harbored a desire for his father's death, in the same way as he was initially intrigued by Ivan's atheist formula that all is permitted if there is no immortality, he did not act on his desire. Nor does the atheist formula ultimately persuade him. Nevertheless, only with the death of his biological father, a man who never really was what a father should be, and through the suffering he endured as a consequence of the murder investigation, is Dmitry able to recognize his criminal intent and therefore his shared responsibility for the man's death, and thus embrace the one who, in Christian terms, is truly and eternally his father: God.

Alyosha's path is similar. Deprived of fatherly guidance from his biological father, the youngest son turns to Zosima as a spiritual father. In a crisis situation comparable to Dmitry's, it is only when Alyosha's spiritual father dies that he encounters a mystical experience through which his faith in God the Divine Father is reaffirmed and strengthened.

The ideological struggle concerning the existence of a God of love and justice is thus directly represented by the causal plot,

through the relationships which the sons establish with the father figures in the novel – biological, spiritual and divine. There is, however, one further parallel between the ideological quest for Divine Fatherhood and the causal plot. While, so far, the role of fathers has been discussed, the function of children in the novel is equally significant. What many refer to as a subplot of The Brothers Karamazov centers around the story of Ilyusha and Alyosha's friendship with him and his classmates. This story is connected to the main plot – the murder story – in a motivated causal sense, through Dmitry who had publicly disgraced Ilyusha's father, and accidentally, when Alyosha encounters the boys. The conflicts which the boys experience mirror those which characterize the, now adult, Karamazov brothers. It is made clear that these children – for the moment relatively innocent – have as much potential to turn towards evil as towards good. Where, among the adults, a father figure dies, the child Ilyusha, who will serve to unite the boys both to each other and to Alyosha, also dies. Moreover, Alyosha, who had recently lost his spiritual father, and his biological father, and who through their deaths had found his place as a son of God, becomes a spiritual father to these boys, who in turn are brought, both through Alyosha's guidance and through love for their young friend, to faith in the goodness of God and a desire to work good in the world. Therefore, just as Dmitry comes to God through his dream of the starving babe, the memory of the suffering Ilyusha directs the boys on to a Christian path of brotherly love and mutual responsibility.

In contrast with the foregoing, however, for Ivan, God's goodness can not be derived from the suffering of innocent children. On the contrary, that children suffer and die tragically is the focal point of his strongest reply to those who, at the ideological level, emphasize God's love and forgiveness. Ivan says to Alyosha:

> Если страдания детей пошли на пополнение той суммы страданий, которая необходима была для покупки истины, то я утверждаю заранее, что вся истина не стоит такой цены. (II, v, 4, стр. 266)

At another point, despite this seemingly passionate declaration of love for children, Ivan admits that he is unable to love individual people. (II, v, 4, стр.256-257) Consequently, when he raises the atrocities committed against children and through them provides dramatic examples of God's injustice, he nevertheless speaks of children as a general class – not as separate people whom he might have known and loved personally. In contrast to this, the God that Alyosha and Zosima represent loves individuals: the Son of God did not die for humanity as an abstract category of beings, but for each person. As such, the spirit of love and celebration which engulfs the children upon the suffering and death of Ilyusha, a child whom they had known personally, is a more credible indication of God's relationship with his people than the more abstract reference to suffering children which Ivan voices to support his rebellion against the Divine Father. Bakhtin writes: "On Ilyusha's grave a little child's church is erected. And this, as it

were, is an answer to Ivan . . . The only harmony that has a living soul is harmony created on living suffering."[39]

Furthermore, where, at the ideological level, Ivan's charge that God has unjustly utilized the suffering of children to pay for salvation is countered by the notion that 'everyone is responsible for everyone else', the story of Ilyusha as a defence of God's justice is given additional support by the practical application of the principle of mutual responsibility in the murder story. Through the events which unfold, it becomes clear how all the brothers, as inheritors of the Karamazov sensuality, share responsibility for the death of their father. In a similar way, each human being, as an inheritor of the human capacity to commit evil, is responsible for the sins of his human brothers everywhere. In this sense, not even the smallest child is entirely innocent, but by the very condition of his humanity bears the potential for evil. Therefore, within a Christian framework, there is no such thing as the suffering of a completely innocent child.

Finally, Ivan's confidence in man's justice, which is implicit in his rejection of divine justice, is also destroyed by the causal plot: by man's interpretation of justice, Dmitry is judged guilty of parricide and sentenced unjustly to suffer for a crime he did not commit. But, by God's justice, the suffering was given to Dmitry as a divine gift to enable him to find a joy and peace in God, which he otherwise might never have found. Moreover, Dmitry is able to see how, even without this reward, the suffering

---

[39] M. Bakhtin, ed. and trans., C. Emerson, Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minneapolis, 1984), p.281.

is in fact justified as a consequence of his shared responsibility for the murder. This demonstration of the higher justice, which God is able to bring about from the injustice of man, is clearly meant for Ivan to observe. He knows for certain that Dmitry's conviction will be unjust. As such, he is made acutely aware of the failure of the judgement of man, on which he had previously based his criticism of God. He is thereby forced to experience personally the inadequacy of his belief that, in the absence of God, 'all is permitted'. Indeed, it is the defeat of Ivan's philosophy in the events of his own life which can be seen as largely the cause of his mental breakdown, as well as his potential for recovery.

Clearly, the causal plot does not simply depict the two-fold theme of fatherhood. It also responds to the principal points expressed in the religious 'debate': the suffering of innocent children, mutual responsibility, justice, and – a point which will be dealt with more specifically later – the notion that 'all is permitted'. Indeed, the sum total of the causal movement of events and interactions which form the story line may be said to enter the religious 'debate' as an independent 'voice' interacting dialogically, agreeing and disagreeing, with the voices of the other participants. While, in the Socratic Dialogue, truth is to be discovered through the interplay of differing points of view, expressed by characters who are free to speak independently of Socrates, the characters in The Brothers Karamazov, by their parallel freedom to move and act, may discover the truth of the problems surrounding fatherhood by their participation in and mutual determination of the various situations and events of the

story. That is, the situations in which the characters find themselves and the interplay of diverse actions provoke and help shape each character's inner search for fatherhood; at the same time, the outcome of those actions affirms the very conclusions of the search which the characters together reveal at the ideological level.

In the Dostoevskian novel, however, the characters are not the only participants in the collective discovery of truth. Through a consideration of the architectonics of The Brothers Karamazov – the structural aspect of the plot – I will demonstrate how Dostoevsky organizes the material of the novel and utilizes specific devices in such a way as to foreground the dynamics of the theme of fatherhood and to provoke the reader's active involvement in the ideological 'debate' and the corresponding search for truth. Just as the author allows his characters to speak and act relatively free of any outside control, he also allows the reader to come to his own conclusions concerning the ideological question surrounding fatherhood, independent of the chronicler's, or the author's own, point of view.

The discussion of the causal plot revealed two planes on which the characters participate in the novel. The first plane, that of pure action, surrounds the murder plot and the practical side of the search for fatherhood. The second plane, that of ideas, surrounds the ideological struggle connected to the spiritual aspect of this search – namely, the conflict between faith in God the Father and atheism. The practical dimension and the ideological dimension were shown to be separate, and yet

inextricably linked thematically and dialogically. As Victor Amend writes, "[while Dostoevsky] entertains his reader with a compelling story line, he also entertains, in the highest sense of the word, with his brilliant and cogent discussion of philosophical problems."[40]

The structural plot of The Brothers Karamazov may also be viewed as consisting of two planes or dimensions, which are separate and yet dialogically intertwined. David Danow distinguishes these as:

1) the 'subtexts', which stand outside the present time of the novel, and

2) the 'main text', which actively advances the story line.

The 'subtexts' which exist in the novel are also of two types. The first type, the anecdote, describes a past incident which involved one of the characters. The anecdote, as such, may be seen as a contiguous, metonymic extension of the main story line, and reveals crucial information about the characters which will help the reader understand the events and interactions which are presently unfolding. The second type of 'subtext', Danow explains, is the incorporated text, which "is drawn from either a fictive or documentable source outside the realm of the novel proper."[41] This type of tale, by the metaphoric association of similarity, also reveals the crucial aspects of the ideological dimension of the novel and, thereby, foregrounds for the reader

---

[40] Victor Amend, "Theme and Form in 'The Brothers Karamazov'," Modern Fiction Studies, vol.3-4 (1957-59), p.242.

[41] David Danow, "Subtexts of 'The Brothers Karamazov'," Russian Literature, XI (1982), p.176.

their importance. Thus, by enhancing and responding to the principal elements of the novel – the practical events surrounding the action and the ideological 'debate' – the 'subtexts' interact "dialogically" with the 'main text', drawing the whole work into a tightly spun web of association, designed to foreground the theme of fatherhood.

The associations described above which unite the 'subtexts' with the 'main text', and, as well, the method of relation which brings the action of the novel together with the spiritual debates, all belong to the technique of point and counterpoint: "The art ... of playing off complementary and opposing characters, themes, or plots against each other."[42] Dostoevsky begins with only subtle hints of the themes and crucial elements of his novel. Through the contrapuntal association of the 'subtext' with the actions and themes developed in the 'main text', and through the use of counterpoint to structure the 'main text' itself, the author gradually advances the elements introduced at the beginning of the novel, bringing them to their crescendo and denouement with the skill of a composer. It is this layering of themes, levels, etc., based on their metonymic or metaphoric connections with previous subtexts or with material from the 'main text', that gives the novel a delicately interwoven harmony that may indeed be likened to a musical polyphony.

The contrapuntal technique, which places contradictory material side by side and which builds a complex web of

---

[42] Harry Shaw, Dictionary of Literary Terms, (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1972), p.98.

interconnections and associations, draws the reader actively into what can appear to be the chaotic, illogical mixture of the unmixable. Like the participants in the ancient carnival, the reader enters the world of the novel as an 'active player', unsure of what will be around the next corner: a fool or a saint, a murder or a conversion, a scene of drunkenness and debauchery or a theological 'debate'. At the same time, a series of literary devices is employed specifically to enhance the reader's expectations and maintain his interest. The most prominent of these are foreshadowing and the enigmatic. These devices, like the structural technique of counterpoint, serve to direct the reader to crucial relationships so that he, along with the characters, may be part of the collective search for truth.

The manner in which the structure outlined above foregrounds the theme of fatherhood and provokes the reader's active participation in the ideological 'debate' may be demonstrated through the example of Book One of The Brothers Karamazov: "История одной семейки." The techniques and devices utilized here are the same as those employed throughout the novel. Only with regard to time, as was illustrated in the time chart, does Book One differ structurally from the other Books. That is, the events described in these first five Chapters are presented in the past; whereas, the remaining Books, while technically set in the past, present the action of the main plot as unfolding in the present. Consequently, the way in which the indeterminate and whirlwind nature of time underscores the narrative incidents and heightens the relationship between the

action of the novel and the ideological dimension will not be discussed beyond its representation in the time chart. However, despite this drawback to using Book One as the structural model for the rest of the novel, this introductory section is nevertheless the best choice for the following reason: if the introduction, which does not contain any of the 'present' action of the novel, can be shown to be unified within itself according to the same complex methods of composition as that which unites the novel generally, then the overall strength and consistency of Dostoevksy's system will be evident. Additionally, if the author's elaborate polyphonic system can be proven to serve as an effective unifying principle in Book One, where the causal movement of events in time does not exist, then it is clear that this method of unification functions independent of time. Moreover, becauses the actions and events which take place are not subservient to the task of providing a conventional unity, they can indeed appear as freely emergent and even illogical, as they are in real life.

"История одной семейки," would appear to begin in the conventional manner of a nineteenth-century novel, namely, with the biographical background of the Karamazov family. Upon closer scrutiny, however, this introductory Book is no more conventional than the rest of the novel. Parallel to the structure employed throughout The Brothers Karamazov, Book One is arranged according to the seemingly haphazard combination of strange subtexts and the counterpoint of themes. With regard to the background stories of the first Book, Victor Terras, citing Likhachov, writes that here "there is no motivation, [there is, P.A.]

staccato narrative, and no logic... all of it [the elements of the book] enhanced by stylistic paradoxes, ambiguity, and an acceptance of strange developments at their face value."[43] Nevertheless, information given in this section, whether obviously or obliquely, foreshadows the crucial elements surrounding fatherhood which are to become more prominent as the action of the novel progresses.

According to the chapter headings of Book One, it would appear that each chapter has been designed to discuss one of the principal characters: Fyodor, Dmitry, Ivan, Alyosha and Zosima, respectively. While the character indicated by the heading may be said to be the focus of the chapter, each chapter is nevertheless riddled with subtexts and digressions which often relate more directly to a character discussed in another chapter or to thematic elements whose significance are to become apparent only later. This layering of associations between and within the chapters enhances the thematic unity among the chapters, and indeed between Book One and the rest of the novel. It demands as well the reader's strict attention to detail. Also, the polyphonic layering allows the author to introduce from the beginning the complex intertwining of ideas and actions which will be recognized later as the central themes and thematic variations of the novel. That is, the crucial elements of the novel are introduced and their interrelations with one another

---

[43] A Karamazov Companion, p.101.

foreshadowed even before any present action of the novel has taken place.

Consequently, the polyphonic structure of Book One can not be adequately illustrated by simply examining the chapters according to the order in which they occur, because the layering, which foregrounds the main traits of the characters and foreshadows the principal themes, operates both within and across the individual chapters. Instead, the architectonics of the first Book will be demonstrated in two parts: first, I will trace the distinct chains of associations initiated by the insertion of various 'subtexts' to show how these highlight the dominant features of the leading characters; and secondly, I will show how the major themes of the novel are foreshadowed in each of the chapters by the relation which exists between the information provided in the 'main text' and the characters to whom the chapter titles refer.

In Chapter One, in the midst of the description of Adelaida Miusov, Fyodor's first wife, the chronicler incorporates a brief tale describing a suicide: a young lady who, out of secret love for a man whom she incorrectly believes she could not have married, imagines herself to be another Ophelia and kills herself by plummeting into a lake. The chronicler compares the temperament of Fyodor Pavlovich's first wife to the suicide, explaining that Adelaida, who had eloped with Fyodor Pavlovich and then three years later taken up with a divinity student, was similarly attracted by the dramatic side of romance. Through this explicit parallel between Adelaida and the lady who had committed suicide, other crucial attributes of Adelaida, which are

shared by the lady, are highlighted. Fyodor's first wife is described as a "дама горячая, смелая, смуглая, нетерпеливая, одаренная замечательною физическою силой." (I, i, 1, стр. 8) Although the personality of the lady in the tale is not explicitly described, the extreme nature of the act of suicide suggests that she was as passionate, daring and impatient as Adelaida. When, in Chapter Two, the chronicler describes Fyodor Pavlovich's impression of Dmitry, the son of Adelaida, as "легкомыслен, буен, со страстями, нетерпелив," (I, i, 2, стр.12) there is a simultaneous reminder not just of his mother, but of the lady who had committed suicide. As a consequence of the double reminder of Dmitry's fiery, passionate and dramatic inclination in Adelaida and in the lady, these features of his character are foregrounded.

But, the incorporated tale in the first Chapter is not only associated with Adelaida. When in Chapter Three the reader is acquainted with Sophia, Fyodor's second wife, he is reminded again of the young lady who had committed suicide. First of all, where the lady in the tale had committed suicide by drowning, Sophia had previously attempted to hang herself – both incidents were desperate acts of overly sensitive, passionate and somewhat melodramatic young women. Secondly, the chronicler reinforces his initial reference to the suicide, explicitly stating that Sophia's decision to marry Fyodor Pavlovich was comparable to jumping in the river. Indeed, the marriage was destined to be a disaster

from the beginning, because of the contrast between Sophia, "кроткая, незлобивая и безответная," (I, i, 3, стр.12-13) and her uncouth new husband.

However, as the attempted suicide suggests, Sophia was not always as mild and gentle as the chronicler first described her to be. In Chapter Four an incident is related in which this young woman, in hysterics, had held her two-year old infant child, Alyosha, before an icon and prayed to the mother of God for him. Like the report of the attempted hanging, this anecdote reveals another side of Fyodor Pavlovich's second wife: the passionate, high-strung streak which was reflected in the lady's suicide, and more directly exhibited in Adelaida and Dmitry. But, where the passionate and fiery inclination of Adelaida and Dmitry allows them to be violent and unruly, Sophia's passion and fire is directed toward an unwavering faith in God. As a result, the strength of Sophia's spiritual belief in God is emphasized by its contrast with the violent physical strength displayed by Adelaida and Dmitry. Furthermore, the coincidence in Sophia of humility and apparent passivity with an almost fanatic faith in God serves to heighten, as well, the depth of this woman's faith. Finally, in the same chapter, Chapter Four, the similarity between Fyodor Pavlovich's second wife and her son, Alyosha, is suggested when the reader learns that the boy, who was always very spiritual, ardently desired to serve the truth in which he had come to believe, and, as such, at the age of nineteen he had planned to become a monk. Indeed, the chronicler informs the reader that Fyodor Pavlovich would often tell the boy how much he was like

his mother. Alyosha, who is the final link in the above described chain of associations, is thus foregrounded as a pious young man, whose passions were aimed at serving God and his elder.

Where the personalities of Dmitry and Alyosha are emphasized by similar comparisons with their mothers, stemming initially from the example of the lady who had committed suicide, Ivan's character is also underscored by its relation to the example of his mother. The association this time, however, is contrastive. The third Chapter, which deals principally with Ivan, begins with the description of the boy's mother, Sophia. The woman's vulnerability and humility are contrasted to Ivan's arrogant independence and to his pride. When the reader learns here of Sophia's ardent faith in God and, in Chapter Five, of Ivan's equally passionate rejection of the Divine Father, the disparity between mother and son is enhanced. As a result, Ivan's rejection of the God, in whom his mother so deeply believed, is foregrounded. Where Dmitry's passion was, at least initially, exhibited through violence and Alyosha's through faith in God, Ivan's passion, also very much in the spiritual realm, was directed toward rebellion.

The dominant traits of Fyodor Pavlovich's character, like those of his sons, are accentuated largely through the use of 'subtexts'. These reveal him to be a debauched, sensual buffoon. The first chapter ends with an anecdote telling how Fyodor Pavlovich derived great pleasure out of going from town to town complaining of how his wife, Adelaida, had run off with a divinity student. When he learns that she had died, he is described as having also made a public affair of her death, some reporting that

he had rejoiced at his new freedom, others that he had wept bitterly. Later, the buffoonery of Fyodor Pavlovich, which he exhibits with great relish, will be seen to provide comic relief from serious topics which might otherwise be too cumbersome. As well, with his deeper self hidden under the mask of a buffoon, Fyodor Pavlovich, like the players at an ancient carnival, is able to utter the most absurd and insulting statements, whose very candidness will often hit closer to the mark than the statements of most other characters.

The fifth main character, Father Zosima, is introduced in Chapter Five. In this chapter, little is revealed directly about him. However, two incorporated tales foreshadow important events involving the elder which will later take place.

The first tale describes the death of a martyr for Christ. According to the legend, the man had long ago disobeyed a command from his elder. As a result, to the astonishment of those who had believed him to be a saint, his coffin is hurled out of the church at the moment when the presiding deacon reads the liturgy: "Оглашенные, изыдите." (I, i, 5, стр. 29) This tale relates metaphorically to Zosima's death. The people had believed him to be a saint, and as such they were convinced that his body would not decay. When in fact it does begin to decompose, scandal results and some of the people come to believe that this was a sign from God that the revered elder was not a saint, but rather a messenger of the devil.

The second incorporated tale describes a monk who had found spiritual comfort and rest on Mt. Athos. To his grief, his

elder demands that he leave Athos and go out into the world to Jerusalem and to Siberia. Similarly, just before Zosima dies he tells Alyosha that he must leave the monastery – the boy's one place of spiritual comfort – and go out into the world where he will be needed.

In keeping with the nature of the 'subtexts' to reveal information about a character other than that indicated by the chapter title, the two tales recounted in Chapter Five have more to do with Alyosha than with Zosima. First, it is with respect to Alyosha that the elder's death and the scandal caused by his decay ultimately lead to a strengthening of the young man's faith in God. Secondly, Alyosha's decision to act as a missionary for good in the world, which follows from Zosima's command that he leave the monastery, is the source of the fatherly direction which the young man gives to the children in the novel – a direction whose consequences, as noted earlier, counter Ivan's rejection of the Divine Father.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that the 'subtexts' found in each chapter of Book One refer more to characters in another chapter, the character indicated by the chapter title and the contents of the chapter do bear a specific thematic relation to one another. As well, the reader's curiosity is aroused by the insertion of seemingly irrelevant material and by the chronicler's use of the enigmatic. These inserts, seen in relation to the characters dominating the respective chapters, foreshadow the principle conflicts and themes which, centering essentially around the question of fatherhood, will be developed throughout the rest of

the novel. The analysis of Book One, therefore, is not complete without an examination of the relation that exists between the character indicated by the chapter title and the specific thematic elements that are present there.

Chapter One, entitled "Фёдор Павлович Карамазов," begins with the enigmatic statement that Fyodor Pavlovich became a celebrity because of his 'tragic and mysterious' death. (I, i, 1, стр. 6) In this Chapter, Fyodor Pavlovich is introduced as fundamentally cruel and depraved. As a result, the reader's curiosity to find out the details of his mysterious death is provoked.

In Chapter Two, a highly suggestive detail is provided. After having described Dmitry's violent, unruly nature and the money dispute between him and his father, the chronicler explains that it is this confrontation over money that leads to the catastrophe which is the subject of the main plot. For the first time, the reader is given the idea that Dmitry may be the perpetrator of parricide. Where in Chapter One the title purely depicts its content, the title of Chapter Two, "Первого сына спровадил," may be understood as an ironic contrast to the main theme of the chapter. Although, in keeping with a direct interpretation of the title of this chapter, the chronicler briefly describes how the infant Dmitry is taken from his father and passed from hand to hand as a consequence of Fyodor Pavlovich's complete neglect, the second half of the chapter deals with Dmitry's return to his father and his insistence on the inheritance from his mother. Indeed, in the long run, the father has not 'shed'

his son after all. But, more strikingly, the dominant idea presented here is Dmitry's anger toward his father and the confrontation between the two. Combining this piece of information metonymically with the information that Fyodor Pavlovich is to be murdered, the reader implies that, instead of Fyodor Pavlovich 'getting shed of' his son, Dmitry will actually 'get shed of' his father.

In Chapter Three, entitled "Второй брак и вторые дети," Ivan, as already mentioned, is contrasted with his pious mother, Sophia. There is no special significance to the chapter title. However, information given about Ivan is crucial. This son, exceptionally intelligent, but cold and proud, had just published a startling article on the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts, which had such impact among academic circles that both clerics and atheists believed the author to be one of their own. First of all, Ivan's sudden popularity among clerics and atheists alike would immediately remind the nineteenth-century reader of the warnings that were being pronounced everywhere at that time regarding the coming of the Antichrist – the truth to be preached by Christ's arch rival is to appear so universal as to be believed by people of all different religions and creeds. As the action of the novel and its ideological dimension progress, Ivan will be increasingly associated with the devil. Secondly, contiguous to the mention of Ivan's article which affirms his intellectual ability and suggests a possible demonic dualism, the question as to why Ivan had chosen to come to his father's town at this time is posed. The chronicler adds coyly and with a tone of mystery: "Столь

роковой приезд этот, послуживший началом ко стольким последствиям, для меня долго потом, почти всегда, оставался делом неясным." (I, i, 3, стр.17) Only much later is Ivan's intellectual complicity in the murder revealed and the explicit connection made between his rejection of the Divine Father and his role in the death of his biological father. However, the theme of intellectual parricide is already foreshadowed here by the contiguous, metonymic relation of these two pieces of information: the reader is to suspect that Ivan, too, may have a part to play in his father's death, and that this role is somehow related to his intellectual pride which prevents him from accepting God the Father.

The title of Chapter Four, "Третий сын Алёша," similar to the title of Chapter One, neutrally describes the subject of the chapter. Here, through an anecdote describing a conversation which had taken place recently between Alyosha and Fyodor Pavlovich, the reader is acquainted with what will develop into the central ideological theme of the novel – namely, that concerning the conflict between faith in the Divine Father and atheism, and the participants' corresponding search for truth. When Alyosha, who is presented as a deeply spiritual Christian, asks for his father's permission to enter the monastery, Fyodor Pavlovich responds by telling Alyosha of an instance where in one monastery the monks secretly received French girls. Then, with this mockery hardly finished, Fyodor becomes instantly very pious, and asks Alyosha to pray for him. He also asks the boy if there are hooks in hell, which will be able to drag him down.

When Alyosha responds that hooks do not exist there, Fyodor Pavlovich adds, alluding to Voltaire, that then 'il faudrait les inventer'. The conversation concludes with Fyodor asking Alyosha to try to find out the truth so that he can return to let him know. The full significance of this conversation can only be realized later when Ivan echoes, with reference to God, the same words from Voltaire [Il faudrait l' inventer]. However, even at this point the image of hooks dragging sinners into hell and of Fyodor Pavlovich, depraved and sinful, asking his son to pray for him and to bring him the truth remains.

Thematically, the last Chapter of Book One, entitled "Старцы," may be viewed as an extension of the previous Chapter, described above. Where in Chapter Four the dialogue between Alyosha and Fyodor Pavlovich is the first suggestion of a religious dimension to the novel, in this Chapter the two sides of the conflict between faith in God and the rejection of God are introduced more directly. First, the fact that there is a dichotomy between faith and doubt is asserted at the beginning of the Chapter in a short digression on realism. If a believer in God the Father is a realist, miracles will never confound him. Rather, "он именно по реализму своему должен непременно допустить и чудо." (I, i, 5, стр. 27) However:

> если он [реалист] не верующий, всегда найдёт в себе силу и способность не поверить и чуду, а если чудо станет пред ним неотразимым фактом, то он скорее не поверит своим чувствам, чем допустит факт. (I, i, 5, стр. 27)

While here it is explicitly stated that Alyosha is the believer whose realism strengthens his faith, Ivan will later be shown to be the atheist realist whose torment lies in his inability to believe irrationally in a God of love and ultimate justice.

Secondly, the atheist leitmotif embodied by Ivan that 'all is permitted' if there is no immortality is suggested indirectly in Chapter Five through the positive example of Alyosha. The chronicler writes that, because Alyosha strongly believed in the 'truth', he desired to perform good works in service of this truth. Were he, however, to have become convinced that God and immortality do not exist, he would then have joined the atheist socialists in an effort to build a tower of Babel without God. The implied connection between these two statements is the atheist leitmotif. That is, disbelief in God and immortality both destroys any reason to desire to perform good works and, at the same time, permits one to act in any manner he pleases, without God. Two days into the start of the action, the principal builder of the 'tower of Babel' will be shown to be the Grand Inquisitor – Ivan's fictional character who most explicitly embodies the formula that 'all is permitted if there is no immortality', and through whom Ivan argues against the truth presented by the Divine Father in Christ.

Thirdly, the Christian leitmotif that 'everyone is responsible for everyone else', which stands against the atheist formula in a very close negative parallel relationship and which is the theoretical refutation of Ivan's main criticism of God – based on the suffering of the innocent – is alluded to in this chapter as

well. The chronicler explains that the Russian people, exhausted by their own and by the world's suffering and sinfulness, see in Zosima hope and cause for joy: this holy man's wisdom and righteousness is an indication that the ideal of truth and justice has not vanished from the earth but "стало быть, когда-нибудь и к нам перейдёт и воцарится по всей земле, как обещано." (I, i, 5, стр. 32) The Russian people are burdened not only by their own suffering and sinfulness, but also by the suffering and sins of the world. As such, just as each man shares the responsibility for the sins of the world, he also shares in the suffering of his fellow human beings.

Finally, Chapter Five concludes with an abrupt return from the spiritual plane to the practical, and from the narrative past to the present time, with a description of Alyosha's impression of the relationship between himself and his brothers. He felt close to Dmitry, but found that he was unable to understand his mysterious half brother, Ivan. The chronicler's expressions of Alyosha's intuitive feelings about his brothers are perhaps the most enigmatic statements in Book One, and at the same time they subtly foreshadow the interrelation between the main plot, surrounding the parricide, and the ideological dimension of the novel, surrounding faith in God and intellectual atheism. First of all, Alyosha felt that "Иван чем-то занят, чем-то внутренним и важным, что он стремится к какой-то цели.... Он [Алёша] совершенно знал, что брат его атеист." (I, i, 5, стр. 33) Second of all, he noticed that Dmitry spoke of Ivan with strange emotion. Only later, the

chronicler writes, did Alyosha learn the details of the important matter,"которое связало в последнее время обоих старших братьев замечательною и тесною связью." (I, i, 5, стр. 33) During the course of the novel the reader learns how deeply Ivan was tormented with the problem of belief in the Divine Father and how his atheist formula ultimately led to the murder of his biological father. As well, the secret connection between the two older brothers is later established to be a common desire to ensure that Grushenka does not choose their father over Dmitry – hence, the shared motive for parricide. At this point, however, these enigmatic statements, considered in light of the rest of the information in Book One, heighten the reader's expectation of the unfolding of some dramatic event and draw him into the drama by provoking him to act as detective in solving the truth of the combined fateful death and religious mystery play.

Where in Book One of The Brothers Karamazov the information presented and the themes foreshadowed were centered principally around the three legitimate brothers, the remaining Books and Parts of the novel are likewise organized with respect to Dmitry, Ivan and Alyosha. In the first Book, the thematic relation between the brothers' personalities and the information provided in conjunction with each of them could only be suggested obliquely. However, as the murder plot and the ideological dimension of the novel progress, each brother becomes increasingly identified with a main theme. Just as, in the first Book, thematic elements are highlighted by playing off one

element against another, throughout the novel the major themes and leitmotifs are foregrounded first by their embodiment in the brothers and secondly by the contrapuntal arrangement of the brothers and their themes with respect to one another. On the one hand, information regarding all three brothers is revealed in each Book, in the same way as each chapter in Book One reveals information about characters dominating another chapter. On the other hand, each Book, like each Chapter in the first Book, focuses on one of the brothers and the theme he embodies. To properly illustrate the importance of Book One as a basic introduction to the novel and to demonstrate the overall consistency of theme and style, the remaining Books and Parts of The Brothers Karamazov will be discussed with respect to theme.

Books Two and Three, which complete Part One, may also be viewed as introductory. Although the actual action of the novel begins with Book Two, essentially only the initial situation, which will provoke the parricide and the ideological 'debate' concerning God, is revealed during the remainder of this first Part. That is, by the end of Part One the characters are introduced directly through their own actions and voices, and the themes, which had been vaguely suggested in the first Book, are explicitly defined.

Book Two, which takes place at the monastery, centers initially around Ivan and his article on the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts. The cold, intellectual atheism of its author, although not apparent in the article itself, seems evident during the discussion of church and state. Nevertheless, at the same

time, the elder perceives that Ivan is tormented by a dualism, stemming from his inability to solve the conflict within himself regarding the existence of God the Father and immortality. Zosima says to him: "Идея эта ещё не решена в вашем сердце и мучает его...ибо настоятельно требует разрешения." (I, ii, 6, стр. 76) Furthermore, when Miusov, hoping to embarrass Ivan in front of the monks, mentions that Ivan has devised the formula, alluded to in Book One, that 'everything is permitted if there is no immortality', this leitmotif is henceforth ascribed to Ivan. The theme which he comes to represent is intellectual atheism.

Alyosha is silent during the discussion between Ivan and the monks, and indeed during the whole meeting. However, his character is illuminated and his theme identified through Zosima, the boy's elder and spiritual father. The theme of humble faith in God the Father, which contrasts Ivan's theme of intellectual atheism, is preached by the Elder Zosima, and exemplified by Alyosha through his humble silence and his respect for Zosima. As well, where the atheist leitmotif that 'all is permitted' is embodied by Ivan, the corresponding Christian leitmotif of mutual responsibility, also alluded to in Book One, is indirectly linked to Alyosha through its formulation by Zosima. The elder says: "Любовь такое бесценное сокровище, что на неё весь мир купить можешь, и не только свои, но и чужие грехи ещё выкупишь." (I, ii, 3, стр. 56)

Dmitry arrives near the end of the meeting at the monastery – which, ironically, had originally been planned to

resolve the monetary conflict between him and Fyodor Pavlovich. The conversation quickly switches from spiritual matters to the family problem at hand. When Grushenka's name arises, Dmitry shows himself to be as unruly and passionate as he was described in the second Chapter of the novel. In the sixth Chapter of Book Two, entitled "Зачем живёт такой человек!," Dmitry angrily echoes the chapter title with regard to his father, who had been provoking him with his buffoonery in the same way that he had been provoking Miusov earlier in the meeting. Consequently, Dmitry is identified by the characters present and by the reader as a potential father-killer. Therefore, the initial theme which comes to be associated with Dmitry is parricide.

With regard to the events surrounding the conflict between biological father and son, which include the love triangles and most of the main story line, Dmitry is the principal hero. With respect to the struggle between faith in the Divine Father and atheism, which is played out at the ideological level, Alyosha and Ivan are the principal heroes.

The brothers, however, can not be exclusively assigned to one of the two dimensions of the novel. This is clear from the third Book of Part One, entitled "Сладострастники." In Book One, Dmitry's violent temperament and Alyosha's religious convictions were shown to be rooted in a fundamentally passionate nature. Here also Ivan is described to have adopted the atheist position with the same ardor. Furthermore, in the second Book, a principal theme and/or leitmotif was seen to be embodied in an extreme fashion in each brother:

1) Ivan's leitmotif is the idea that 'all is permitted if there is no immortality; his theme is intellectual atheism;

2) Alyosha represents the leitmotif that 'everyone is responsible for everyone and for everything'; his theme is humble faith in God;

3) Later Dmitry will be connected most essentially with Alyosha's leitmotif and theme. However, through much of the novel his theme is parricide.

Finally, in Book Three, a tendency toward extremes, which allows the brothrers to be associated with a theme, is linked to the 'Karamazov sensual drive'. It is present in all members of the family. Even Alyosha and Ivan, who – as the 'pro and contra' of the ideological 'debate' between faith and atheism – would appear to be divorced from the passions of the physical world, exhibit this sensualism: during the discussion that takes place between Alyosha and Dmitry following the gathering at the monastery, Alyosha directly admits to his older brother that he feels the Karamazov drive; and, later in the evening when Dmitry attacks his father, Ivan exhibits an odd, sensual delight in the love triangle involving Dmitry and Fyodor Pavlovich. At the same time, Dmitry, whose physical sensualism is evident – his romantic entanglements indeed occupy much of the Book – is also passionate with regard to his love for the Divine Father. He says to Alyosha: "Пусть я иду в то же самое время вслед за чёртом, но я всё-таки и твой сын, господи, и люблю тебя." (I, iii, 4, стр. 116)

The idea that Dmitry will kill his father, the Dmitry theme, is significantly developed in this Book as the full nature of the desperate situation involving Grushenka is revealed. In particular, in the Chapter entitled "Сладострастники," the idea is firmly implanted when Dmitry actually attacks his father, promising to kill him the next time. However, in Book Three as well, Ivan's involvement in parricide, in conjunction with Smerdyakov, is also foreshadowed. Where, in the first Book, the description of the complimentary reception of Ivan's article by both Christians and atheists suggests a possible diabolic side to its author, Smerdyakov is directly introduced as demonic, and a link is explicitly made between Ivan and Smerdyakov. This parallels the secret connection between Ivan and Dmitry, which had been mentioned in the first Book. Later, the day before Dmitry's trial, it will be revealed that, where the relation between Ivan and Dmitry involves a common motive for murder, Ivan and Smerdyakov are linked by the actual act of parricide. As was explained in the section on causal plot, Smerdyakov bridges the crime story with the religious mystery play by the murder of the biological father in order to please Ivan and to test the older brother's formula that 'all is permitted' if there is no God or immorality.

With the principal characters, themes and the situation surrounding the main plot fully introduced in Part One, the themes can be treated in their own right during the remainder of The Brothers Karamazov. That is, each remaining Book is centered around one of the main themes – parricide, atheism or faith – and

consequently around one of the three brothers – Dmitry, Ivan or Alyosha.

Part two principally advances the ideological dimension of the novel – the struggle between faith in the Divine Father and the rejection of God. The first Book of Part Two, entitled "Надрывы", deals with the problem of suffering which, as was mentioned previously, is the basis of Ivan's spiritual rebellion. Alyosha is disturbed by the knowledge that his elder will soon die, Ivan is tormented because of his desperate love for Katerina, the child, Ilyusha, and his father suffer from disgrace and poverty. In the sense that the deep pain of each of these characters is unavoidable, it appears to be the result of the unkind or indifferent hand of providence. Thus, although Ivan only directly appears in Chapter Five, entitled "Надрыв в гостиной," and although other major ideas are touched upon, he may be viewed as central to the Book. On the one hand, the dramatization of torment provides practical examples of undeserved, 'innocent' suffering, which Ivan will voice as his principal criticism of God the Father. On the other hand, events surrounding Alyosha's sorrow over the impending death of Zosima and the subplot surrounding the suffering and death of Ilyusha, which have been introduced in this Book and seem to support Ivan's position, later come to show the fallacy of this position, providing instead proof of God's power to bring joy from suffering.

The Book described above, Book Four, which forces the reader to focus on suffering, leads directly into the second Book of Part Two. Entitled "Pro and Contra," Book Five centers explicitly

around Ivan and the theme of intellectual atheism. Here, citing tales of suffering children, Ivan first explains his reason for rejecting God's justice and his promise of salvation. Secondly, in the celebrated chapter "Великий инквизитор," he offers his own alternative to Christianity within the framework of interpreting western Catholicism. Through Ivan's fictional Inquisitor, the atheist leitmotif that 'all is permitted' is personified. However, at the end of this Book Ivan's confidence in a world without God and in the idea that 'everything is permitted' is shaken. When he meets Smerdyakov on the day before the murder of Fyodor Pavlovich, the lackey half-brother draws him subtly into a plot to commit parricide. Although he implicitly agrees to go along with Smerdyakov's plan, as indeed it accords with his atheist formula, Ivan is greatly tormented by a deep sense of evil within himself.

The last Book of Part Two entitled "Русский инок," which treats the Alyosha theme of humble faith in the Divine Father, counters Book Five. Through the voice of Alyosha, Zosima's teachings about faith and forgiveness are presented. Suffering, instead of being an example of God's injustice, is argued to provide evidence of his great mercy and love, for only through suffering can one attain true joy and the knowledge of God's goodness. Furthermore, where the causal plot demonstrates how the Christian leitmotif of mutual responsibility supports this notion, Zosima explains in this Book that everyone, including those who are more innocent than others, is responsible for the sins of

everyone else, and consequently he must suffer both for his own sins and for the sins of the world.

The profound philosophical and religious ideas presented in Books Five and Six of Part Two are the heart of the theme of fatherhood, and indeed the high-point of the ideological dimension of The Brothers Karamazov. Here, the two opposing sides – faith in the Divine Father and the rejection of God – are fully presented side by side and dialogically played off against one another. Where in this part the problem of suffering is revealed to be the crux of the ideological 'debate', Zosima's defense of suffering is thereafter given practical application in Part Three.

Book Seven, the first Book of Part Three, follows Alyosha's theme of faith in God. Very early in the morning of the third day set within the time of the novel the Elder Zosima dies, and the resulting scandal caused by the rapid decay of his body, which had been foreshadowed in Chapter Five of Book One, brings Alyosha great sadness. With his spiritual father dead, he undergoes a short period during which he doubts the love of the Divine Father. At Grushenka's in the evening of the same day as the elder's death, however, Alyosha's despair is lessened through the tale of the onion. As told by Grushenka, this incorporated tale teaches that one single act of kindness is sufficient to allow forgiveness for a lifetime of sins. By analogy, if one kind act can forgive a multitude of sins, then, as the Christian leitmotif asserts, the continual love and kindness of good people will be able to redeem the world. Encouraged by Grushenka's faith in the one onion, Alyosha returns to the monastery where he has a dream in

which Zosima and Christ appear to him. From out of his despair itself, the reality of God's love and justice is reinforced and he awakens with a new strength to serve God and his world.

Books Eight and Nine focus on Dmitry. Indeed, his theme of parricide is brought to its high-point here. The eighth Book may be divided into three parts: 1) Dmitry's desperate attempt to find three thousand roubles in order to repay Katerina and take Grushenka away with him, 2) his violent rendezvous with Gregory and, although the details are not revealed, the murder of Fyodor Pavlovich, and 3) his wild party at Mokroye with Grushenka and the Poles. As Dmitry moves from one place to another, his mental state rapidly deteriorates. A number of factors contribute to this: first, a consciousness of his disgrace for not being able to repay Katerina, secondly, despair that he has lost Grushenka, and thirdly, remorse for having possibly killed Gregory. Convinced of the hopelessness of his situation, he decides to go to Mokroye to have one last look at Grushenka before he commits suicide. When, very late that night, the prosecutor and investigators arrive to question Dmitry regarding the murder of his father, his mental deterioration has reached the point of delirium.

In Book Nine, Dmitry undergoes a different type of suffering – that caused by the criminal interrogation. After the gruelling, night long ordeal is finished, Dmitry is allowed to sleep before he is taken away. While asleep, he finds relief from his own suffering through a mystical dream of a suffering babe. The result is an epiphany, similar to Alyosha's, in which he comes to know God's love and justice in the midst of his torment. Filled

with a feeling of responsibility for the pain of the child, Dmitry realizes the truth of the Christian leitmotif that 'each person is responsible for everyone', and therefore he awakes willing to bear the responsibility and suffering for the parricide, which he did not commit.

By the end of Part Three, the ideological drama (the religious mystery play) and the main plot (the crime story) have reached their peak. As such, in Part Four the denouement of both dimensions of the novel begins. The first Book of this last part centers around the story of Ilyusha, and Alyosha's relationship with him and the boys. Following upon the death of Zosima and its aftermath, which had been described in Book Seven, Alyosha's faith in God is reaffirmed, and he is given a new strength to leave the monastery and continue the work of the Divine Father in the world. In Book Ten, with Ilyusha and his little friends, Alyosha's active ministry in the world begins. Although Alyosha does not yet say much to the boys regarding God, his kind, loving presence among them comforts the boys, who are greatly saddened by the fatal illness of their friend Ilyusha.

Similar to the movement in Part Two from the theme of suffering to that of intellectual atheism, in Part Four the chronicler switches from the theme of the boys and their suffering to Ivan. Where previously, in "Pro and Contra," Ivan was shown to be tormented by the presence of evil, in Book Eleven the depth of his demonic dualism is revealed, and is shown to be specifically connected with a link to his illegitimate half-brother. During the three meetings between Ivan and Smerdyakov that take place

during the two weeks prior to the trial (and two months after the murder of Fyodor Pavlovich), the link between the two is explicitly uncovered to be the evil conspiracy to murder their father. Ivan comes to recognize that this connection to Smerdyakov is diabolic, and attests to the presence of that element within himself. As he is increasingly made aware of his demonic side, Ivan moves toward insanity. By the end of the Eleventh Book, his dualism has become so extreme that he envisions a devil and enters into dialogue with him, but he is unable to determine whether the devil exists or is but a part of himself.

In the last Book, entitled "Судебная ошибка," the chronicler returns to Dmitry's theme of parricide. This long Book covers Dmitry's trial in detail. It is divided into two parts: the case of the prosecution and the argument of the defense. In the middle of the preceedings, Ivan takes the stand. He displays the money Smerdyakov had given him, which is supposed to prove the lackey's guilt, and he insists that Smerdyakov had killed Fyodor Pavlovich on his, Ivan's, instructions. Ivan, however, is judged to be insane and his testimony is therefore disregarded. Consequently, this Book, and with it the body of the novel, closes with Dmitry's conviction. Indeed, according to the evidence presented at the trial, it is more reasonable to believe that Dmitry is the murderer than that Ivan and Smerdyakov had secretly plotted to commit the crime because of a diabolical adherence to an intellectual idea. Nevertheless, despite Dmitry's conviction and

the suffering which he knows will follow, the joy which he had found through faith in God the Father remains.

Each Book of Part Four is thus organized according to the resolution of one of the three main themes of the novel. The first Book centers around the theme of faith, and shows Alyosha's decision to work for good in the world. The second Book deals with atheism, and the deterioration of Ivan's mental state as a result of his rejection of the Divine Father. The final Book concludes the theme of parricide, and renders a secular decision on Dmitry's fate.

At the same time, Part Four can be seen to discredit Ivan's side of the ideological 'debate'. In Book Ten, Ilyusha's fatal illness and the sadness of those who love him are not seen as the cruel hand of providence, but rather, through Alyosha, God's love is revealed to be present in the very midst of their suffering. In Book Eleven, Ivan's mental illness, which is caused by his inability both to believe in the devil and to remain an atheist, shows that he is unable to bear his own philosophy: his torment suggests his awareness that God the Father and immortality do exist, so everything is not permitted. Finally, in the last Book, Ivan's confidence in man's secular justice is shattered by the conviction of Dmitry: he had rejected God's justice because it allows innocent suffering, but innocent people are also made to suffer by man's justice system.

Where throughout Part Four the atheist stance in the ideological 'debate' is defeated at the practical level, in the epilogue the Christian position is shown to be victorious. First, the

joy, which results from Dmitry's conversion experience and his faith in the love of God, do not diminish after his conviction, but rather are strengthened along with his desire to atone for his sins. Although he wants to escape jail in order to be with Grushenka, the new Dmitry feels that he must face his ordeal so that, through suffering, he may be able to pay his debt to humanity. Secondly, the suffering and death of Ilyusha lead the boys to faith in God. In an episode that recalls the sermon on the mount, Alyosha comforts the boys during the 'speech by the stone', and explains to them that they can find joy in the world simply by loving one another. He continues to say that even though some of them may work evil some day, if they remember the one time that they were good and kind to Ilyusha, they – like the woman who had once given away one onion – will be able to be saved. The boys are deeply moved by Alyosha's speech and ecstatically resolve always to remember Ilyusha and Alyosha's message of love. Where disbelief in immortality had been the root of the murder of the biological father and part of Ivan's rejection of God the Father, the boys' happiness and desire to further the cause of good result mostly from Alyosha's assertion of God's promise of eternal life. Following the boys' musings on the future they will have with Ilyusha once they have been raised from the dead, The Brothers Karamazov ends triumphantly with the joyous cheers of the boys as they walk hand in hand.

Clearly, the higher, ideological aspect of the theme of fatherhood, which centers around the conflict between faith in the Divine Father and unbelief, is not only mirrored at the level of

plot by the physical movement of events, which in turn centers around human father figures and culminates in the murder of the biological father. But also, the two dimensions of this theme are enhanced and their relation to one another foregrounded by the polyphonic manner in which they are tightly interwoven between and within the Books of The Brothers Karamazov.

Furthermore, the specific thematic movement that takes place among the Parts of the novel between the higher, spiritual aspect of the theme of fatherhood and its lower, physical manifestation may been seen to resemble the 'rise and fall' of diverse thematic elements which characterize a musical polyphony. To conclude the discussion of the structural representation of the theme of fatherhood, the Parts of the novel will be discusssed with respect to illustrating how the interplay between the two dimensions of this theme effect a polyphonic unity at the level of plot.

In Part One, the principal characters and the elements that comprise the two-fold theme of fatherhood are introduced fully. Book One consists of the background information that is required if the reader is to understand the complications that ensue as the novel progresses. Book Two begins on a light note with the buffoonery of Fyodor Pavlovich, who also shows himself to be sensual and depraved. Zosima's visit with the Russian peasants and the discussion in the elder's cell about Ivan's article on the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts – scenes which foreshadow the ideological 'debate' regarding faith and atheism, the climax of the higher dimension of the theme of fatherhood –

advance the Book to a more serious, higher level. With Dmitry's arrival, the focus then returns to the lower, earthly aspect of this theme as the enmity between Fyodor Pavlovich and his oldest son is demonstrated. In the Third Book, the full nature of the conflict between father and son is advanced to the point of extreme tension. When Dmitry violently attacks his father, the parricide, which is the climax of the physical dimension of the fatherhood theme, is vividly foreshadowed.

The last scene in Book Three which, set at the monastery, depicts Zosima's pending death and Alyosha's sorrow over the realization that he will be losing his spiritual father, leads directly into Part Two which deals principally with the ideological aspect of the theme of fatherhood, and thus mainly with Ivan and Alyosha. Book Four, entitled "Надрывы," illustrates many different types of human suffering. First, the spiritual suffering that Zosima expresses, caused by his awareness of the presence of evil in the world and heightened to the point of satire by his spiritual enemy, Father Ferapont, is contrasted to the earthly suffering of Fyodor Pavlovich, the other father figure, who fears that he may be murdered by Dmitry, his rival for Grushenka. Second, Ivan is shown to be tormented by his unrequited love for Katerina, while Katerina, in turn, suffers because of her love for Dmitry. Finally, Book Four ends with the suffering of young Ilyusha and his family as a result of the human conditions of poverty, illness and disgrace.

The last two Books of Part Two, "Pro and Contra" and "Русский инок," comprise the central ideological 'debate' that

indirectly involves Ivan and Zosima. As such, Book Four may be seen to serve as an introduction to Ivan's argument against God and Christ, an argument based on the problem of human suffering. Parallel to the pattern found in Part One, Part Two begins on a practical level with concrete examples of individual suffering, advances to a higher level of abstraction with Ivan's intense argument argument against God, and concludes on the highest note with Zosima's discourse in support of Divine Fatherhood.

In Part Three the focus returns predominantly to the physical dimension of the theme of fatherhood with the murder of Fyodor Pavlovich and its aftermath. The bridge between Part Two and Part Three is made in Book Seven. This Book centers around the higher dimension of the fatherhood theme, but on a more earthy level with the death of the elder and Alyosha's despair over the scandal caused by the premature decay of his body. In a parallel manner, Books Eight and Nine cover the murder of the other human father figure, Fyodor Pavlovich, and Dmitry's ordeal prior to the murder and during the criminal investigation. Where, in Book Seven, Alyosha's sorrow is changed to joy following a revelation of God, in Book Nine the torment that Dmitry suffers during the humiliating interrogation is relieved by a mystical conversion experience in which he comes to recognize his guilt and his need for forgiveness. Consequently, although most of Part Three deals with the physical aspect of the fatherhood theme, and indeed contains its most climatic moment (the parricide), the examples of Alyosha and Dmitry, who are provided with the way out of their suffering by a revelation of the love and forgiveness

of God, provide practical affirmation of Zosima's response at the ideological level to Ivan's complaint over human suffering.

In Part Four, the novel's last, the ideological aspect of the fatherhood theme and the physical manifestation of this theme are brought together and resolved. Each Book focuses principally around one of the three brothers and the resolution of the theme he embodies within the framework of the general theme of fatherhood. Book Ten centers around the newly converted Alyosha and his role as a spiritual father to the boys, who are faced with the approaching death of their young friend Ilyusha. In Book Eleven the tension increases as the focus switches to Ivan and his side of the ideological conflict concerning God and the idea that, without God, 'all is permitted'. Gradually as his word of rebellion is revealed to be the cause of his father's murder, Ivan, who is thereby forced to recognize the evil inherent within himself and at the heart of his atheistic ideology, succumbs to incipient mental illness. Book Twelve, which covers the long trial, provides an ironic contrast to Book Eleven, where the murder is revealed to have been committed by Smerdyakov and Ivan. As counter evidence to the alleged supremacy of human justice with which Ivan is connected, Book Twelve farcically reveals the fallibility of human judgement when Dmitry is mistakenly found guilty of the murder of Fyodor Pavlovich. Ultimately Book Twelve is synthetic in nature, for it resolves both the physical aspect of the theme of fatherhood and the higher-plane argument surrounding the denial of God and the supremacy of a man-God to whom all is supposedly permitted.

Where Ivan's word is shown to fail in Part Four, the Epilogue to The Brothers Karamazov ends on a high note with Alyosha's 'speech by the stone' where the victory of Zosima's position in favor of Divine Fatherhood over and against Ivan's rebellion is vividly reinforced.

To summarize, in this chapter, through an analysis of plot, the search for fatherhood was shown to be a general unifying theme of The Brothers Karamazov. That is, the central ideological 'debate' concerning faith in God the Father and the rejection of God was displayed as inextricably linked to the dynamics of plot, surrounding biological, spiritual and divine fathers. First of all, actions and events that develop dramatically during the story-time were seen to express the same themes and elements which form the heart of the ideological 'debate'. At the same time, the outcome of these events was shown to respond to the principal points raised during the religious arguments; as such, it was argued that the plot of The Brothers Karamazov interacts dialogically with the interlocutors in the ideological 'debate'. Secondly, the main themes and elements of the novel, and the bridge which they provide between the ideological drama and the main story line, were seen to be foregrounded by the work's architectonics. More specifically, the relationship which these themes and elements bear to one another, as well as to both aspects of the search for fatherhood, was revealed through a discussion of point and counterpoint with respect to the three legitimate sons.

Furthermore, through this two-fold discussion of plot, each brother was revealed to embody a main theme and to play a key role with regard both to biological and spiritual fathers and to the 'debate' concerning the existence of God. The position which each of the brothers was shown to hold may be summarized briefly as follows:

1) Dmitry is the 'hero' of the main story line surrounding the murder of Fyodor Pavlovich; while he does not actually kill his father, he is the obvious suspect from the start of the novel, and thus embodies the theme of parricide. Through the course of his suffering, he undergoes a spiritual transformation where he comes to espouse the Christian ideal of 'mutual responsibility'.

2) Ivan is the 'anti-hero' of the ideological 'debate' concerning the existence of God; caught in – and almost ruined by – the contradiction between a mind which cannot accept God's love and justice and a heart which longs to believe, Ivan embodies the theme of intellectual atheism. His strongest 'intellectual' criticism of divine justice lies in the suffering of the innocent. Also, the atheist axiom that 'all is permitted if there is no immortality' is formulated by him, and is at the root of his own complicity in the murder of his father. Consequently, where Dmitry embodies the theme of parricide but does not kill his father, Ivan, who is very much connected with the murder causally, embodies the theme of parricide at a deeper level.

3) Alyosha is the 'hero' of the ideological 'debate' over fatherhood; believing strongly in God and desiring to work good in the world, Alyosha embodies the theme of humble, but passionate

faith. The Christian ideal of mutual responsibility, which is later embraced by Dmitry, is clearly expressed from the beginning of the novel by Alyosha. Most importantly, this ideal counters Ivan's rejection of God – which had been based on the unacceptability of innocent suffering – since, just as all sins are held in common, so too is suffering shared by all as a source of atonement and, therefore, as a means to the peace and joy that accompany redemption.

4) Although the action of the novel does not center around Smerdyakov – the putative illegitimate son of Fyodor Pavlovich – as extensively as it does around his three brothers, he too was seen to play a crucial role with respect to the theme of fatherhood: through him the murder of the biological father is linked to Ivan's intellectual rejection of the Divine Father. Consequently, Smerdyakov, like Ivan, embodies both the theme of parricide and that of intellectual atheism.

CHAPTER 3: DISCOURSE AND MIRRORING IN THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV

In Chapter Two, the personalities of the Karamazov brothers, their themes and the crucial elements surrounding the search for fatherhood in The Brothers Karamazov were presented. The thematic web of interconnections, which ties the ideological struggle – concerning God the Father – with the main plot – surrounding the parricide, and the relationships that the three legitimate brothers in particular form with biological and spiritual fathers, was also illustrated. However, the inner motivations behind the actions of these brothers require further examination. That is, the stages which mark the internal development of each of the legitimate brothers[44] remains to be discussed.

How does Dmitry, the potential parricide, become, by the end of the novel, an ardent supporter of the Christian idea of mutual responsibility? How does Ivan, the once proud intellectual atheist, fall prey to a mental breakdown over the death of one about whom he cared little? And, finally, how does the quiet, humble Alyosha of the monastery scene become, in the last pages of the novel, the fiery author of the moving speech by the stone?

---

44 As was shown in the previous chapter, the illegitimate brother, Smerdyakov, fulfills an extremely important function in the novel. As the perpetrator of the parricide on the grounds of Ivan's idea that 'all is permitted if there is no immortality', the lackey dramatically bridges the higher and lower dimensions of the theme of fatherhood. Nevertheless, because he does not undergo the stark inner transformations that his brothers experience, Smerdyakov will be discussed in this chapter only in so far as he may be seen as a double of Ivan and thereby serves to illuminate hidden aspects of Ivan's character which foreground Ivan's relation to the theme of fatherhood.

These questions can best be answered through an analysis of discourse in the novel.

Through the use of verbal syncrisis (the juxtaposition of various points of view toward a given object) and anacrisis (the provocation of the word by the word), each of the three heroes, like the participants in a Socratic Dialogue, is able to test his own idea about the Divine Father against those of the other characters. From out of the mixture of opposing voices, some more authoritative than others, the hero is then forced to respond to a revealed truth about his own idea.

Nina Perlina, drawing on Bakhtin, distinguishes two types of discourse in The Brothers Karamazov:

1) 'the authoritative word' is based on an older authority existing beyond the realm of the novel per se; the indisputable authoritative word, she explains, is Holy Writ, or speech which reflects a Christian standpoint; this type of discourse is voiced as a commandment and its purpose is to reveal the truth.

2) 'the internally persuasive word' is introduced as a character's own original idea; as this word interacts with the internally persuasive words of other characters, it provokes additional words both of the character who utters the initial word and of the other characters whose words interact with it; as such, it is not finalized (unlike authoritative discourse) but "illuminates hidden and undiscovered aspects of the speaking person."[45]

Perlina further explains that on the basis of these two

---

45 Nina Perlina, Varieties of Poetic Utterance, (Lanham, M.D.: Univ. Press of America, 1985), p.16.

types of discourse the evolution of a hero progresses in three stages:

1) he establishes an internally persuasive word as his own;

2) he then attempts to comprehend the authoritative word through his own internally persuasive word;

3) he assimilates the authoritative word into his own consciousness.

This three-stage process "encompasses the entire life of the hero, with his downfalls and moral transformations, his searchings and strivings, and the final disclosure of truth."[46] In this chapter, the stages which mark the internal development of each of the legitimate brothers will be partly discussed with reference to the three stages outlined by Perlina.

Clearly, the web of interconnections which ties the novel into a polyphonic balance of contrapuntal themes and elements is far more intricate than can be illustrated purely through a consideration of plot. Through the technique of character-mirroring – by which images of each of the main characters are created so that their respective 'alter egos' come to represent the same themes and leitmotifs that the hero himself embodies – the threads that make up the web of thematic interconnections are significantly increased. The result is a complex tightly woven, elaborately complex polyphonic structure. Thus, where the actions of the novel and the contrapuntal juxtaposition of the brothers foreground the search for fatherhood, the many mirror

---

[46] Ibid, p.17.

images of each brother strikingly reinforce, as if in bold-type, the dynamics of this general unifying theme.

This system of mirroring is established partly through dialogic interaction and partly through situational echoing. "In real life we hear speech about speakers and their discourse... People are set up by others' words, or agree with them, refer to them, and so forth."[47] In The Brothers Karamazov, dialogic interaction occurs between internally persuasive words as the interlocutors respond to each other, while at the same time seeking to assimilate the authoritative word into their own ideas. The type of response which a character voices to a hero's word is what partially may serve to establish him as a mirror image of that character.

But, if the characters act according to the dictates of inner thoughts they voice, then the echo of the events and situations resulting from their actions can be compared to the imitation of voices. Therefore, just as verbal dialogicity helps to establish the alter egos of a character, so too do situational echoes – a kind of nonverbal dialogicity – also effect the same pattern of mirroring. Indeed, in The Brothers Karamazov, the use of situational echoing is so prominent that there are almost as many situational echoes as there are mirror images of each of the main characters.

In this chapter, two principal objectives will be fulfilled: 1) as already mentioned, the internal development of each of the legitimate brothers will be discussed in view of the three stages

---

[47] Ibid. p.14.

through which each progresses dialogically toward a discovery of the truth of himself and of the ideological quest concerning Divine Fatherhood; and

2) the counterpoint of themes, discussed in Chapter One, which draws the action of the main plot surrounding human fathers and father figures into a close polyphonic relationship with the ideological quest for God, will be shown to be magnified through the echoes of these themes and their interconnections which are established by the technique of mirroring.

Since the portrayal of the inner development of a hero and the advancement of the polyphonic system of thematic development are both built on discourse and mirroring, which in turn are most fully revealed in conjunction with one another, these two objectives will be pursued together, and with respect to each brother. I will begin with the oldest brother, Dmitry, as the principal hero of the main plot surrounding the murder of his father. Secondly, I will discuss Ivan, since he provides the bridge between the main plot and the ideological dimension involving God the Divine Father. Finally, I will treat the youngest brother, Alyosha, who is central in countering Ivan's ideological position against God, and by whose moving words The Brothers Karamazov triumphantly ends.

Of all the brothers, one can assume that Dmitry undergoes the most extreme internal change. Yet, the person he shows himself to be at the end of the novel is not entirely unexpected. If his actions alone were to be presented, then the changes in his outlook on life would indeed be surprising, and artificial.

However, through verbal imitation and situational echoing, characters who demonstrate a potentially redemptive longing for God are associated with Dmitry. Consequently, these characters highlight, as well as serve to motivate, the young man's often subconscious path from a desire to murder his biological father to a desire to enter into a relationship with God, who can be understood as his Divine Father. Moreover, these basic elements, which are part of the more general quest for fatherhood, are further emphasized by the practical and symbolic relation between Dmitry's movement from debauchery to grace and the respective roles of those characters, who may be viewed as his alter egos.

First, the two characters who most clearly echo the words and actions of Dmitry as he unconsciously moves from the rejection of one father figure to an espousal of faith in another, Divine Father, are precisely the two father figures in the novel – Fyodor Pavlovich and Father Zosima. Secondly, Grushenka – a third character who mirrors crucial aspects of Dmitry's personality – stands between Dmitry and his biological father as a powerful cause of the tensions that engender parricidal tendencies in the son. At the same time, she fulfills the function of an intermediary between Dmitry and the spiritual father of the novel, Zosima, through an expression of her new-found desire that she and Dmitry follow the path of righteousness toward a relationship with God.

In Book One, Dmitry is initially described negatively by the chronicler, as "легкомыслен, буен, со страстями,

нетерпелив." (I, i, 2, стр.12) But, when the reader is directly introduced to him at the monastery, the sincere and dignified manner in which he bows before the elder, his father and the other people present would rather suggest that he is a respectable, self-controlled gentleman. As soon as he speaks, however, the traits of his character that the chronicler had highlighted become apparent. His words are voiced gruffly and clumsily, with an undertone of anger. After he had solemnly kissed the elder's ring, Dmitry abruptly begins by apologizing for his lateness, explaining "с необыкновенным волнением, почти с раздражением" (I, ii, 6, стр. 74) that he had been told the wrong time by Smerdyakov. In another instance a few minutes later, Dmitry, upon hearing the conclusion of Ivan's defence of the formula that 'all is permitted if there is no immortality', interrupts, shouting unexpectedly, and paraphrases the formula in a marked attempt to clarify for himself its meaning.

Dmitry again lapses abruptly into silence until he is provoked to anger by the buffoonery of his father. Jumping to his feet and this time addressing the elder disrespectfully, he shouts with reference to Fyodor Pavlovich: "Недостойная комедия." (I, ii, 6, стр.77) The disgraceful farce, however, could well apply to him also: the incongruity between Dmitry's solemn, pious demeanor and his violent verbal outbursts lends a farcical, exaggerated color to that demeanor.

During the remainder of the meeting, heated insults, exchanged between Dmitry and Fyodor Pavlovich, reveal an

intense sensual rivalry for Grushenka that has consumed the two Karamazovs with hatred for one another. At the high point of the argument, Fyodor Pavlovich challenges Dmitry to a duel. Dmitry responds with the rhetorical question: "Зачем живёт такой человек!" (I, ii, 6, стр. 80)

The carnivalistic combination of buffoonery, depravity and wickedness with the saintliness and piety of the monks increases the note of humourous incongruity, and also ominously foregrounds Dmitry's potential for parricide. At the same time, Dmitry's speech both demonstrates a rejection of his biological father, as a proper father figure, and indicates an ambivalence toward the fatherhood of God as represented by Father Zosima and the monastery setting.

The comic tone created by an incongruity between the actions and the words of Fyodor Pavlovich and Dmitry as well as their shared passion for Grushenka place father and son as mirror images of one another. Where, in the examples provided above, a similarity between the two is suggested by echoes of tone and situation, certain words of Fyodor Pavlovich can also be seen to echo those which will later be spoken by Dmitry. In Book One, the chronicler explains that Fyodor Pavlovich seemed to delight in the public display of his own disgrace. At the monastery, Fyodor Pavlovich describes the perverse pleasure he derives from his buffoonish pretense of offence – a pleasure which is likely rooted in the sense of his own degradation. He says: "Я-то всю жизнь и обижался до приятности, для эстетики обижался, ибо не токмо приятно, но и красиво...." (I, ii, 2, стр. 47)

Later, Dmitry admits to Alyosha that, because he is a Karamazov, he too experiences pleasure from disgrace. He says:

> Если уж полечу в бездну, то так-таки прямо, головой вниз и вверх пятами, и даже доволен, что именно в унизительном таком положении падаю и считаю это для себя красотой. (I, iii, 4, стр.116)

Where Fyodor Pavlovich deliberately exaggerates his actions and words for effect, Dmitry's are exaggerated because of his inner instability. Similarly, Fyodor Pavlovich intentionally makes a public disgrace of himself, while Dmitry is disgraced because of his inability to control his passions. The result in both cases, however, is quite similar: the two appear to the public as ridiculous and debauched sensualists, and both seem to take a pleasure in their notoriety for debauchery.

A second instance of verbal echoing between Fyodor Pavlovich and Dmitry reveals another, more redeemable side of the two Karamazovs. During a conversation between Alyosha and his father, Fyodor Pavlovich, drunk on alcohol and lust, profanes the monastic order by telling a tale of a certain monastery which received French women. Sensing his own depravity – no doubt with more than just a tinge of delight – he suddenly becomes grave and asks Alyosha to pray for him. He adds:

> Я всё помышлял о том, кто это за меня когда-нибудь помолится? Есть ли в свете такой человек? Милый ты мальчик, я ведь на этот счёт ужасно как глуп.... Как ни глуп, а всё думаю, всё думаю, изредка, разумеется, не всё же ведь. (I, i, 4, стр.25)

Later, following the passage quoted in the previous paragraph, where Dmitry describes to Alyosha the pleasure he derives from depravity, the oldest son, despite his wickedness, also speaks of a longing to be counted as a son of God. He says:

> Пусть я низок и подл,... пусть я иду в то же самое время вслед за чёртом, но я всё-таки и твой сын, господи, и люблю тебя.... Я, брат, очень необразован, но я много об этом думал. (I, iii, 4, стр.116-117)

Clearly, in these words of Dmitry are found echoes of the voice of his father, which also indirectly expresses a deep desire to be loved and forgiven. As was illustrated in the first chapter through the discussion of plot, the 'Karamazov drive', by which the heart is able to be quickly and uncontrollably impassioned, could be directed two ways: toward wickedness and vice and/or toward God. Thus, both Dmitry and Fyodor Pavlovich, although debauched and wild, are capable of feeling a sensual longing for God the Father.

Unfortunately, it is too late for Fyodor Pavlovich. Dmitry, however, has reached an advanced stage of consciousness of the contradiction in himself which allows him to find pleasure in debauchery and, at the same time, to seek a relationship with God. In his own words, he describes this problem as a conflict within the heart between the ideal of the Madonna and that of Sodom. The range of human feelings, he concludes, is too deep for him to control, for in the heart of a sensualist, such as himself, both extremes fall under the mysterious, indefinable nature of beauty. In perhaps what has become one of the most quoted statements of

The Brothers Karamazov, Dmitry declares: "Тут дьявол с богом борется, а поле битвы – сердца людей." (I, iii, 4, стр.117)

Where, at the monastery, Dmitry's words are clumsy and abrupt, and are thus very ill suited to his actions, during the subsequent discussion with Alyosha – the main points of which are described above – his words, although equally passionate, begin to exhibit an inner grace and harmony. According to Perlina's three-stage path toward truth, the first step on this path, which involves finding one's own internally persuasive voice, had not yet been taken by the Dmitry who speaks in the elder's cell. But, by the time he meets with Alyosha, where under the loosening effect of alcohol he poetically describes his conflict between 'the ideal of the Madonna and that of Sodom', Dmitry now speaks in his own internally persuasive voice. Moreover, this new voice, which expresses the spiritual battle between good and evil, incorporates within itself a positive response to the authoritative word of scripture. As such, at this point in the novel, Dmitry has gone beyond the first step of the path toward truth; that is, he has both found his own inner voice and, also, found a way to view the word of authority in light of his own personal situation. He is on his way toward faith in the Divine Father.

Appropriately, the reversal that takes place in Dmitry – between the time of the meeting in the elder's cell and his meeting with Alyosha later in the evening – can be seen to have been provoked at the monastery by Alyosha's spiritual father,

Zosima. Through the voice of the elder, Dmitry is re-acquainted with the words of scripture, which Gregory had read to him long ago as a child. Speaking principally to Ivan, but for the benefit of all those present at the meeting, Zosima quotes scripture, explaining that the most noble duty of the heart is "горняя мудрствовати и горних искати, наше бо жительство на небесех есть." (I, ii, 6, стр. 76) Then, a few minutes later – after the heated argument between Dmitry and Fyodor Pavlovich had ended – Zosima enigmatically bows before Dmitry, saying: "Простите! Простите все" (I, ii, 6, стр. 81) These words indirectly express the Christian leitmotif of mutual responsibility. At the same time, they foreshadow Dmitry's pending interrogation regarding the murder of his biological father and his resulting conversion to faith in the Divine Father. Dmitry, who the chronicler explains "стоял несколько мгновений как пораженный... (и) наконец вдруг вскрикнул: 'О боже!" (I, ii, 6, стр. 81), is profoundly affected by this incident. The more redeemable aspect of his sensual nature, which indeed has the potential to desire 'to seek high things', is awakened by Father Zosima's words and reinforced by the stunning effect of the holy man's parting gesture to him.

Nevertheless, his passion for debauchery and his potentially parricidal lust for Grushenka remain. Tormented by the conflict between these two sides within him, Dmitry is forced to clarify for himself the relationship between the word of authority and the uncontrollable, contradictory passions within him. The search for a resolution of the dichotomy involving good

and evil, and the hope for a way out of the depths of depravity to redemption form Dmitry's internally persuasive word. This word is not formed prior to a conception of the authoritative word of scripture, but as a direct rejoinder to it; as such, Dmitry has only the last stage of the path to complete: the reconciliation of a higher truth with his own internally persuasive word, which means finding the solution to man's dualism in his own heart so that he can turn wholly to faith in Divine Fatherhood.

It is this striving to reconcile the authoritative word with his own internally persuasive word, a desire to solve the conflict between good and evil within his own heart, which is the source of Dmitry's innermost torment. Metaphorically, he describes his inability to embrace the word of authority thus:

> Как я вступлю в союз с землею навек? Я не целую землю, не взрезаю ей грудь... Я иду и не знаю: в вонь ли я попал и позор или в свет и радость." (I, iii, 3, стр.116)

Two days later, he will have to undergo a humiliating and ruthless interrogation regarding the murder of his father. Following this ordeal, Dmitry has a mystical dream of a suffering babe, during which he is able to identify his own suffering with that of the babe, and ultimately with the suffering of the world. As proof to the contrary of Ivan's argument against the Divine Father, Dmitry awakens from his dream of the suffering child a new man, risen, as it were, from the seed which had fallen to the earth. For the first time he is able to begin to integrate his own word with the authoritative words of Father Zosima, not by rational argument

but through an experience of joy in the knowledge of God's love and forgiveness. He says:

> Понимаю теперь, что на таких, как я, нужен удар, удар судьбы... Никогда, никогда не поднялся бы я сам собой! Но гром грянул. Принимаю муку обвинения и всенародного позора моего, пострадать хочу и страданием очищусь! (IV, ix, 8, стр. 551)

As Dmitry is being lead to prison, where he will await his trial, he repeatedly asks everyone to forgive him, while still insisting that he had not killed his father. Consequently, where up until now Dmitry had been associated primarily with the theme of parricide, from this point on the ideal of mutual responsibility and the theme of faith increasingly become more dominant within him.

The path that Dmitry takes from an uncontrollable sensual passion for Grushenka, which almost caused him to murder his father, to an equally passionate desire to receive the forgiveness of the Divine Father, which allows him to accept responsibility for the death of his biological father – a path, which, in his words, moves from the ideal of Sodom to that of the Madonna – is enhanced by the conversion experience of Grushenka, the very woman who was the cause of his initial disgrace. When Dmitry meets her at Mokroye, he sees that she has become a changed woman. First of all, with the idealistic image of her first lover shattered, Grushenka realizes for the first time that it is Dmitry with whom she is really in love. Secondly, after having told Alyosha the story of the onion earlier in the evening, and as such having been reawakened to the power of

God's unconditional love to redeem even the most despicable of creatures, Grushenka meets Dmitry with a new desire to follow the path of good. Just before the Prosecutor arrives, Grushenka and Dmitry exchange vows of love for one another. With the problem of how to reconcile one's heart with God the Father still unsolved in Dmitry, Grushenka unknowingly leads the way to his conversion by words which attest to her own changed heart. She says:

> Надо, чтобы это честно...впредь будет честно...и чтоб и мы были честные, чтоб и мы были добрые, не звери.... А мы пойдём с тобою лучше землю пахать. Я землю вот этими руками скрести хочу. Трудиться надо. (III, viii, 8, стр. 479-480)

Where two days earlier Dmitry wanted to know how to enter an alliance with Mother Earth, here Grushenka has suggested the way. In the sense that both Grushenka and Dmitry undergo a similar path – a kind of situational echoing – and as well echo one another verbally, Grushenka may be viewed as a mirror image of Dmitry. The changes which take place in her highlight Dmitry's own path from depravity and potential murder of his biological father to faith in the Divine Father.

The events of Dmitry's life, however, which provoke spiritual regeneration, more extensively parallel Zosima's past. That is, more than Grushenka and even Fyodor Pavlovich, Zosima, the other father figure in the novel, may be seen as a very close mirror image of Dmitry. The examples of situational echoing are

numerous, but the more significant of these may be outlined briefly:

1) **Military Life of Drunkenness and Debauchery**
Through the voice of Alyosha, Zosima explains that while in the military he, like Officer Dmitry, was "дикий, жестокий и нелепый.... Пьянством, дебоширством и ухарством чуть не гордились." (II, vi, 2, стр.320-321)

2) **Renunciation of Expected Course of Action – with regard to a woman out of pride or selfishness**
Where Dmitry takes advantage of a young lady, but whimsically decides not to ask for her hand for no other reason than that she expected it, Zosima too decides not to ask for the hand of the girl whom he believes is in love with him simply because he selfishly does not want to lose his freedom. A similar attempt to control through renunciation is made by Dmitry with respect to his fiancée. When Katerina sacrifices her pride to borrow money from Dmitry, he silently gives her the money, and holds the door open for her instead of attempting to seduce her, as would have been expected. As a result, Katerina is indebted to him emotionally, as well as financially. To increase the cost of the emotional debt, Dmitry waits to ask for her hand until she herself declares her love for him.

3) **Influence of a Suffering Child**
Where, from a dream depicting the suffering of a hungry babe, Dmitry comes to recognize his own responsibility for the suffering and sins of everyone, Zosima is moved by the dying words of his young brother: "Знай, что воистину всякий пред всеми за

всех и за всё виноват." (II, vi, 2, стр. 313) Even though he was just a child when his brother's death occurred, Zosima explains that "на сердце осталось всё неизгладимо . . . [и] в своё время должно было всё восстать и откликнуться." (II, vi, 2, стр. 315)

4) **Redeeming Effect of Cruelty to a Servant**

The pathos that Dmitry experiences after having violently, and almost fatally, struck Gregory – his father's servant, who had been like a father to Dmitry as an infant – directs him toward an appeal for God's mercy and forgiveness, which in turn leads him to embrace the Christian ideal of mutual responsibility. Similarly, the youthful Zosima on the eve of a duel violently strikes his servant in the face, and is filled with remorse as he recalls the loving words of his brother, which speak of the equality of all men before God and of mutual responsibility. Zosima, like Dmitry, begs the servant to forgive him, and, spiritually changed, resolves to spend his days in the service of God, the Divine Father.

While, throughout the novel, Zosima's word is synonymous with the authoritative voice of scripture, and in this sense it is monologic and finalized, Dmitry's internally persuasive word remains distinguishable from the authoritative words of Zosima, which he echoes, even after his conversion experience. Although he has indeed begun to integrate his own word with that of authority, and as such is moving directly toward the Christian ideal of unconditional compliance with the principle of mutual responsibility, a trace of the former Dmitry, which remains caught in the sensual passions of the world, continues to cause him to

waver between doing the good that he ought to do and satisfying his more immediate sensual desires.

This internal conflict is particularly evident at the end of the novel with regard to the plans for Dmitry's escape. After Dmitry is convicted of parricide, he is torn between escaping his prison term, so that he can be with Grushenka, or atoning for his sins by serving the sentence. Rakitin plays on this conflict in Dmitry, seeing it as an opportunity to shake his new-found faith in the Divine Father. The divinity student argues that everything is based on science; there is no God and no immortality. Consequently, it is utter stupidity to choose to go to Siberia. Dmitry's faith is, indeed, somewhat shaken. But he is most easily swayed by Rakitin's philosophy because it provides him with the justification to escape with Grushenka – were there no God, he would then be free of any compulsion to leave Grushenka and endure the suffering of forced labour.

The questions that Dmitry considers at this point resemble those which, constituting the main issues in the hidden polemic between Zosima and Ivan, have been central to the ideological aspect of the theme of fatherhood. As Martin Goldstein points out, at this final stage of his development, "the debate of the novel, the conflict between Zosima and Ivan, is ... internalized within Dmitry."[48] Only when Dmitry is able to solve this new dilemma, a problem which ultimately is at the root of his previous inability to seek, with his whole heart, the things of God, will his

---

[48] Martin Goldstein, "The Debate in *The Brothers Karamazov*," Slavic and East European Journal, vol.14, no.1, 1970, p.334.

path toward spiritual rebirth be complete. Only then, as the epigraph to the novel implies, will his seed really have blossomed into fruit.

It is strongly suggested that Dmitry's faith in God will prove stronger than the seeds of intellectual doubt, planted in him by Rakitin. Immediately after his conversation with the divinity student, Dmitry says to Alyosha that he misses God, and that he will go the Siberia: "За дитё и пойду. Потому что все за всех виноваты.... Врет Ракитин." (IV, xi, 4, стр. 639-640) Although, even after this declaration, Dmitry continues to sway back and forth between a decision to escape or stay, Alyosha's confidence that Dmitry will choose punishment and the redemptive power of suffering is more convincing than Dmitry's present indecisiveness. At the beginning of the powerful speech by the stone – the conclusion of the novel – where Alyosha's voice is synonymous with the voice of authority, Alyosha resolutely tells the boys that his oldest brother "пойдёт в ссылку." (Epilogue, 3, стр. 933) During the novel, Alyosha is often shown as possessing the uncanny gift to discern the truth, so, with regard to the decision Dmitry must make, there is reason to assume that he will go to Siberia, as Alyosha believes, and, consequently, that he will find peace through suffering.

Nevertheless, since this conclusion remains an assumption, however probable, Dmitry's future continues to be unfinalized. Just as he had been free to discover the truth regarding Divine Fatherhood in a manner which also provoked a revelation of the truth of his own personality, so too is he free

either to accept or reject that truth. Still, the truth of God the Father, and the way to redemption through suffering, which Dmitry has discovered most fully as a consequence of the death of his biological father, remains valid, whether he ultimately follows it or not.

The fundamental truth underlying the authoritative word of Zosima – the truth of God the Father – is also affirmed by the internal path which Ivan, Fyodor Pavlovich's second son, follows. However, where Dmitry positively discovers the love and forgiveness of the Divine Father, Ivan is forced, through negative experience, to reconsider the truth behind the words of Zosima. His rebellion fails.

Like Dmitry, and Fyodor Pavlovich, Ivan realizes that internally he is split between two opposing positions: on the one hand, he loves life, beauty and truth, passionately and irrationally, and longs to believe in the God who is purported to be the author of all that is good; on the other hand, he is an intellectual, and, ashamed of emotion and irrationality, he is unable to believe in the fatherhood of God, let alone submit his will to a higher authority. Incapable of solving the conflict, between a heart which longs for God and a mind which refuses to believe, Ivan chooses to suppress the longings of his troubled heart by consciously formulating his internally persuasive word in opposition to the authoritative word of scripture. In an attempt to ensure that his irrational desire for God remains buried, he declares his rejection of the purpose of the Divine Father in absolute and unconditional terms.

Nevertheless, Ivan is unsuccessful at completely silencing the 'Karamazovian' desire of his heart for God. As such, one gets the sense that, despite Ivan's declaration to the contrary, he may actually end up choosing God and belief, however irrational. Consequently, the strength of his internally persuasive word – which speaks in the voice of unconditional rebellion against the Divine Father – is weakened as the indecisiveness of this public voice is manifest. At the same time, the intellectual stature of his word is also threatened by the parodic manner in which it is echoed by either ridiculous or pseudo-intellectual characters. These character-mirrors travesty Ivan's ideas and decrease their power of persuasion over the reader by the application of a variety of styles, ranging from naiveté, buffoonery, impishness and, in some cases, outright diabolism. Eventually, the complete disintegration of Ivan's internally persuasive word is effected, both from the point of view of the reader and within Ivan's own consciousness, through dialogues with Smerdyakov, his 'material' alter-ego, and with the devil, the tragic-comic product of his hallucination representing what is despicable and repulsive within himself.

Through these subtle conversations, as well, Ivan's relation to the theme surrounding the quest for fatherhood is starkly foregrounded: first, through Smerdyakov, Ivan's unconditional word of rebellion against the Divine Father – a subtle type of murder – is connected to the despicable, diabolic murder of his biological father; second, during the interview with the devil – one of the most intriguing examples of interior

dialogue in all of Dostoevsky's work – the petty and demonic heart of Ivan's word is sharply exposed. Any of the pride and confidence which he had previously held in his ideas are dramatically crushed. He learns that just as he is unable to accept that the murder of his biological father, and his own guilt, were caused by his once noble word of spiritual rebellion, so too is he ultimately unable to live in a world devoid of the providential hand of the Divine Father – a world which, in rejecting God, he had formerly promoted.

The shock of this realization, and the necessity to decide suddenly between reconsidering the truth offered by God or continuing to cling to a philosophy which has been shown to be a lie result in the collapse of Ivan's mental faculties. It is in this state that he leaves the novel – with the outcome of his spiritual dilemma left indeterminate.

Ivan's internally persuasive word is expressed most clearly during the philosophical discussion which he has with Alyosha at the tavern. Ivan assures his younger brother that while he does not actually reject God – or at least the necessity of man to create him – he simply cannot understand, nor can he accept, God's world and his offer of salvation. The source of this rebellion, and the aspect of the Divine Father's purpose which he refuses to the very end to accept, is the suffering of innocent children for the sins of the guilty. He declares:

> Если страдания детей пошли на пополнение той суммы страданий, которая необходима была для покупки истины, то я утверждаю заранее,

> что вся истина не стоит такой цены. (II, v, 4, стр. 266)

Ivan introduces this central point first with an appeal to the more emotional side of his listener, by providing numerous tales of atrocities committed against children. He then concludes by stating the unconditional nature of his decision to reject Christian salvation and emphasizes the humanitarian basis for this rejection. So that there may be no possibility of misunderstanding, he says:

> Не хочу гармонии, из-за любви к человечеству не хочу... Лучше уж я останусь при неотомщенном страдании моём и неутоленном негодовании моём, *хотя бы я был и неправ*.... А потому свой билет на вход спешу возвратить обратно. (II, v, 4, стр. 266)

As had been Ivan's intention, the painfully graphic tales of suffering children strike a deep chord in Alyosha's heart. The young novice's faith in God the Father is indeed somewhat shaken as he finds himself unwittingly agreeing with Ivan's conclusion that divine providence is unjust. Nevertheless, these tales are told in a hostile, sarcastic tone. The altruistic humanism, therefore, which Ivan had hoped to establish by voicing his willingness to sacrifice salvation as a protest against the suffering of the innocent, is made to appear a façade.

Terras points out that, during the telling of these tales, instead of compassion and love, one encounters "invective at its sharpest: spite, rage, anger, outrage, sarcasm appear in profusion."[49] Clearly, this tone does not accord with a heart so

---

[49] A Karamazov Companion, p.113.

noble and so full of love that it is willing to make the ultimate sacrifice of God's love for the sake of unknown innocent sufferers. Rather, in several instances, one gets the sense that "Ivan may be enjoying telling his little anecdotes."[50] For instance, there may be more than sarcasm in his voice when he refers to a publication which recounts the subhuman treatment of a young boy as a "*прелестная* брошюрка [delightful little brochure]." (II, v, 4, стр. 260 [italics P.A.]) A few stories later, Ivan, possibly encouraged by the painful effect of the tragic tales on his soft-hearted younger brother, attempts to keep Alysoha's interest with the inappropriate, slightly sadistic statement: "Но о детках есть у меня и ещё получше." (II, v, 4, стр. 262) Moreover, in some cases, Ivan's comments are openly sadistic and diabolic. For example, with regard to the action of a Turk who shoots a baby in front of his mother, splitting the infant's head in two, Ivan responds: "Художественно, не правда ли?" (II, v, 4, стр. 259) He concludes the tale with the twisted statement, which could only be intuited by a sadist, that "Кстати, турки, говорят, очень любят сладкое." (II, v, 4, стр. 259)

Ivan's words are so obviously laden with sarcasm and hatred that Alyosha could hardly have been won over by their outward show of compassion. The discussion, therefore, leaves a deep residue on Alyosha's consciousness, not because of any display of altruism on the part of Ivan, but because of Alyosha's own natural love for mankind, which is extremely moved by the

---

[50] Ibid.

tales of innocent sufferers. As such, even though Alyosha finds himself voicing the same doubts as Ivan had raised at the tavern regarding the fairness of divine providence, the persuasive force of Ivan's word is nevertheless sapped as his avowal of love and compassion for innocent sufferers – the explicit reason he offers for rebellion against the fatherhood of God – is undermined by the bile of his speech.

The dark side of Ivan that surfaces during the telling of these tales of suffering children is only one factor which contributes to discrediting his internal word of rebellion against God. As well, the rational argument, itself fraught with inconsistencies, if not outright lies, is weakened directly. For instance, Ivan begins by assuring Alyosha that it is not God he refuses to accept, but the world which the Divine Father has created. Yet, just the day before, in Alyosha's presence, Ivan had twice declared to his father that God does not exist. When Alyosha reminds him of this incongruity, Ivan responds weakly that he had been teasing Alyosha then and that, in reality, God exists because man has created him. However, this statement is as much an affirmation of the non-existence of a divine creator of man as if he were to say flatly that God does not exist. When Ivan concludes his argument with the statement that he will reject the salvation offered by God *even if he is wrong*, his having in truth chosen to reject God is patently evident. At best, Ivan can be seen as pathologically ambivalent. A far less charitable view would see him as purposely deceitful.

A second instance of an inconsistency which exists directly in the argument itself centers around the unconditional nature of Ivan's spiritual rebellion. Ivan explains that he has chosen to reject God's world and the truth offered by the Divine Father because, according to human reason, the requirement that the truth must be paid for in the world by the suffering of children cannot possibly be justified, and is therefore unacceptable to him. With confidence, he declares that he will adhere to this decision *even if he is wrong;* that is, even if at the end of time all that is incomprehensible to human understanding in the world is revealed to be most comprehensible and most truly just and good, he will still refuse to accept it. These are hardly the words of a devotee of truth. Rather, they bespeak a fanatical irrationalism. Moreover, near the beginning of the meeting at the tavern, Ivan had expressed a very different sentiment. Passionately, he confesses to Alyosha that even though he has no faith in divine providence, even though the order of God's world appears contradictory to reason, he cannot help but love life and the beauty in the world:

> Жить хочется, и я живу, хотя бы и вопреки логике. Пусть я не верю в порядок вещей, но дорог и мне клейкие, распускающиеся весной листочки, дорого голубое небо, дорог иной человек... (II, v, 3, стр. 250)

He continues to say that, even though he is convinced that God and immortality do not exist and so there is no ultimate purpose in life, he still admires those from the West who strongly believed in such ideals. Each gravestone of these dead heroes, he declares:

> гласит...о такой страстной вере в свой подвиг, в свою истину, в свою борьбу и в свою науку ... [и] я, знаю заранее, паду на землю и буду целовать эти камни и плакать над ними, – [а] в то же время убежденный всем сердцем моим, что всё это давно уже кладбище и никак не более. (II, v, 3, стр. 250)

Thus, where Ivan insists as part of his 'rational' word of rebellion that he will reject God and the world *even if his position is shown to be false*, earlier, speaking more spontaneously from his heart, he seemed to suggest that he will instead accept the Divine Father and his order *even though he believes such ideals to be false.* In neither case is he consistent.[51]

The relationship between these two declarations – both mutually exclusive and yet each expressed with definiteness – points to a severe split within Ivan, a schism between his intellect which cannot accept God the Father and his heart which longs for him. At the monastery, where the reader was first directly acquainted with the Karamazovs, Zosima had seen beneath Ivan's cold, confident exterior a deeply tormented individual, plagued by the conflict between faith and unbelief, who, out of despair for a solution, sought to divert his mind with sophisticated, daring opinions. He had said to Ivan:

---

[51] It is interesting to note here that the West for which Ivan expresses great admiration, and to which he is linked by many motifs, is nevertheless referred to by him as a 'graveyard' [кладбище]. Similarly, his attack on Christianity, which is presented in the legend through a dubious depiction of the Grand Inquisitor, is most specifically directed against the Western Church in Rome. Ivan's professed adherence to Western atheistic thought in conjunction with his subtle criticisms of the West also attests to his fundamental ambivalence and internal dualism.

> Идея . . . о вопросе Бога и о бессмертии души ещё не решена в вашем сердце и мучает его.... Пока с отчаяния и вы забавляетесь – и журнальными статьями, и светскими спорами, сами не веруя своей диалектике.... В вас этот вопрос не решен, и в этом ваше великое горе, ибо настоятельно требует разрешения... (I, ii, 6, стр. 76)

Ivan did not attempt to deny this assessment of himself, but instead seemed to indicate his agreement by asking for the elder's blessing. When, at the tavern, two very different and opposing voices come from Ivan – one which indirectly expresses a deep longing for faith and another which utters the word of intellectual rebellion against God – Zosima's words and Ivan's response are recalled.

The dualism within Ivan, first intuited by Zosima and later evidenced during the discussion with Alyosha where Ivan explains his rationale for rebellion, is also clearly illustrated in the tale: "Великий Инквизитор", the apotheosis of his rebellious word (see footnote 51). Although this Gothic melodrama was meant to complete the charge of injustice against the Divine Father by providing a more just, humane system for human accountability, Ivan betrays his own intentions when his first voice, which longs for God and absolute truth, subconsciously colors the tale. Despite the fact that he had meant to show Christ as unjust and without compassion, he is depicted as a God of uncommon love and power:

> Народ непобедимою силой стремится к нему.... Он молча проходит среди них с тихою улыбкой бесконечного сострадания. Солнце любви горит в его сердце, лучи Света, Просвещения и Силы текут из очей его и, изливаясь на людей,

> сотрясают их сердца ответною любовью. (II, v, 5, стр. 270)

The Grand Inquisitor, on the other hand, who, as a Roman Catholic Cardinal, was to correct the injustice wrought by Christ and save humanity from the chains of free will, is presented as a cold, selfish autocrat:

> Это девяностолетний почти старик, высокий и прямой, с иссохшим лицом, со впалыми глазами, но из которых ещё светится, как огненная искорка, блеск.... За ним в известном расстоянии следуют мрачные помощники и рабы его и 'священная' стража. (II, v, 5, стр. 271)

Moreover, the Inquisitor, who had sacrificed everything to destroy and rebuild the foundation left by Christ, is tormented by the same sort of partiality to Christ as Zosima had seen in Ivan with regard to God the Father. First of all, the Cardinal indirectly admits Christ's sovereign divinity by allowing him to go free after having sentenced him to death. This is somewhat similar to one of Ivan's voices admitting to a belief in divine providence by admiring God's creation and those who lived ardent lives of faith. Secondly, during the meeting with Christ in the jail cell, the Cardinal longs for his silent prisoner to speak and is as haunted by the truth of his prisoner's identity as Pontius Pilate had been almost two thousand years ago in Judea. Yet, like Pilate, the Inquisitor stubbornly refuses to denounce his own position in favor of what he now knew to be the truth. As Ivan explains, the kiss, which was the prisoner's response to the Cardinal's angry, embittered words of rebellion, "горит на его сердце, но старик остаётся в прежней идее." (II, v, 5, стр.

285) In the same way, Ivan, who longs for God and subconsciously believes in him, will refuse to relinquish his word of rebellion. Alyosha, seeing the Grand Inquisitor as a double of his author, makes explicit this parallel. In response to Ivan's explanation of the effect of the kiss on the Inquisitor, Alyosha says to Ivan: "И ты вместе с ним, и ты?." (II, v, 5, стр. 285)

Clearly, through the person of the Grand Inquisitor, Ivan, as author of the tale, subconsciously demonstrates that he does not believe fully in his own word of rebellion, nor does he have complete confidence in its power to stand against the truth offered by the Divine Father in Christ. Where he had set out to deny all that was of God, he actually ends up affirming it – as though in spite of himself. Alyosha exclaims in response to the legend: "Но... это нелепость! . . . Поэма твоя есть хвала Иисусу, а не хула... как ты хотел того." (II, v, 5, стр. 283) As such, Ivan's internal word of unconditional rebellion against God the Father, which was to be cemented by the legend of the Grand Inquisitor, is hit with another severe blow to its credibility.

The false notes and inconsistencies which pervade Ivan's discourse with Alyosha indeed lead to the downfall of his word against Divine Fatherhood. As well, they reflect the deepening serious spiritual schism within Ivan which will ultimately bring him to a complete mental breakdown. At the same time, the persistent parody of his words and ideas by both buffoonish and naive or pseudo-intellectual characters regularly lowers the stature his word might have in the mind of the reader. Some of

these character-mirrors show his word to be insignificant and shallow; others subtly color his ideas with a sinister undertone. The result is the eventual defeat of his rebellious word as it is shown to lack genuine credibility – in part because it is shown as fundamentally diabolic in nature.

As was the case with Dmitry, the reader is provided with the first sign of the path which Ivan will take in the novel from intellectual pride to mental illness through the role which his father, Fyodor Pavlovich, plays as a character-mirror. Smerdyakov, who will later be shown to be Ivan's principal 'material' alter-ego, says to Ivan: "Вы, как Фёдор Павлович, наиболее-с, изо всех детей наиболее на него похожи вышли, с одною с ними душой-с." (IV, xi, 8, стр.684) Indeed, Fyodor Pavlovich, who like Ivan purports to be an unbeliever, echoes many of the words and ideas of his son. But, what Ivan voices seriously and intelligently, Fyodor Pavlovich echoes in a buffoonish, confused manner. The result is a travesty of Ivan's word and a foreshadowing of the complete failure of his rebellion against God the Father. Danow writes: "That the father mirrors parodically the much more serious intellectual endeavors of his son is a specific feature of the novel – the effect of which is to weaken Ivan's stature as theoretician."[52]

First of all, during a conversation with Alyosha near the beginning of the novel, Fyodor Pavlovich comically misquotes the following statement by Voltaire: 'S'il n'existait pas dieu il faudrait

---

[52] Structural Principles of *The Brothers Karamazov*, p.118.

l'inventer' to argue for the necessity of God to invent hooks, in order to drag sinners into hell. When, much later, Ivan quotes the same statement by Voltaire to validate his own view that God's existence is dependent on man, one is reminded of his father's absurd and inconsequential idea that God is bound by the necessity to create hooks. Although Ivan's statement is quite serious, the metonymic connection between his word and the ridiculous, buffoonish words of his father, which is effected through the use of a common quote, serves to belittle Ivan's atheistic idea.

Secondly, the mistrust of clergymen, which is inherent in Ivan's legend of the Grand Inquisitor, is also expressed by Fyodor Pavlovich when he interrupts the monastery lunch with a clownish outburst of slander against the monks and priests. The same exaggerated criticisms which Ivan's father levies against these holy men are embodied in the person of the Inquisitor, and thus his example reflects negatively on the clergy generally. Furthermore, just as Fyodor Pavlovich's accusations against Christian leaders distinctly ring false, Ivan's view of Christ's church in the West as well as his rebellious response to God, both of which are presented in the legend, are also seen to be founded on inconsistencies and misleading exaggeration. Fyodor Pavlovich can be seen to allude to this connection between himself and his son when he ironically says: "Воистину ложь есмь и отец лжи!" (I, ii, 2, стр. 48)

Finally, during Fyodor Pavlovich's last conversation with Alyosha the day before the parricide, the father repeats two central features of Ivan's rebellion:

1) the choice to reject salvation:

> А в рай твой, Алексей Федорович, я не хочу, это было бы тебе известно, да порядочному человеку оно даже в рай-то твой и неприлично, если даже там и есть он (II, iv, 2, стр.187);

2) the disbelief in immortality: "По-моему, заснул и не проснулся, и нет ничего..." (II, iv, 2, стр.187)

Here, Ivan's words are not travestied by buffoonery, as was the case in the previous examples. They are simply rendered banal. Moreover, linking these ideas explicitly to his second son, Fyodor Pavlovich concludes the discussion with a statement which disputes the intellectual stature of Ivan and his philosophy built on the rejection of Divine Fatherhood. He says: "Вчера Иван здесь хорошо говорил.... Иван хвастун, да и никакой у него такой учёности нет..." (II. iv, 2, стр.187) The parallel between the two, imperfect as it may be, is clear.

That Ivan does not believe in immortality – a feature which is foregrounded by Fyodor Pavlovich – is shown to be loaded with meaning in light of an initial revelation about him, which is made by Miusov, a relative of the family who prides himself as an atheist and a man of enlightened liberal ideas. At the monastery, attempting to degrade Ivan as an intellectual in the minds of the monks, Miusov informs those present of Ivan's declaration that if there is no immortality, then 'everything is permitted', even to the extent of cannibalism. During the previous

discussion which revolved around Ivan's article on the jurisdiction of ecclesiastic courts, Miusov had also sought to undermine Ivan's ideas by continually interpreting them to support Rome and its popes, who have allegedly been seduced by the third temptation of Christ. Although at this point Ivan had not directly voiced his allegiance with Rome, later his Grand Inquisitor is just such a prelate who has consciously taken up the third offer made by the devil; namely, that of worldly dominion. As such, Miusov not only foreshadows Ivan's ideas from "Великий Инквизитор", but in introducing its ideas in the presence of the monks, who are obviously opposed to them, he allows for them to be undermined even before the legend is told. The subsequent mention of Ivan's atheist formula – an idea which is most embodied by the Inquisitor – is thus Miusov's final attempt to discredit Ivan. He concludes:

> По такому парадоксу можете заключить, господа, и о всём остальном, что изволит провозглашать и что намерен ещё, может быть, провозгласить наш милый эксцентрик и парадоксалист Иван Фёдорович. (I, ii, 6, стр. 75)

Clearly Miusov, who strongly dislikes Ivan and consciously echoes his words in a mocking manner, may be seen as Ivan's second main character-mirror. Most significantly, Miusov foreshadows Ivan's part in the parricide both by his relation to Fyodor Pavlovich and by his revelation of Ivan's formula that 'all is permitted'. First of all, when Miusov displays a distinct aversion for Fyodor Pavlovich in the elder's cell, he is associated with Ivan, the other alleged atheist in the room who

also despises the old man. As such, when Miusov expresses his disgust for the father, his voice can be viewed as synonymous with Ivan's. Consequently, when Miusov says to Fyodor Pavlovich: "Зато избавлю себя от вашего общества, Федор Павлович, и поверьте, что навсегда" (I, ii, 6, стр. 81), he utters the unconscious intention of Ivan to kill his father. Secondly, in revealing the author of the atheist formula to be Ivan – a son who loathes his father, who has rejected the Divine Father, and who does not believe in immortality – Miusov shows how Ivan's rebellion against the Divine Father, illustrated in the formula, could also provide him with the rationale to murder his biological father. When, later, Smerdyakov explains to Ivan that he, Ivan, is the principal parricide because the murder was mainly committed on Ivan's instructions to test the idea that 'all is permitted', the words of Miusov are recalled to help illuminate the subtle manner in which Ivan is truly guilty of having 'rid himself' [избавлять] of his father.[53]

In pointing to the connection between Ivan's atheist idea and parricide, Miusov takes the destruction of Ivan's word to a further stage than Fyodor Pavlovich by revealing his word of rebellion not only to be extreme to the point of the absurd, but also to possess a certain diabolic character. In fact, as Danow

---

[53] Furthermore, the possibility of being intellectually guilty for a crime by simply providing the idea is more easily understood in light of the episode between Kolya and the goose. The boy Kolya, who, in having naively declared himself an atheist, may be seen as a double of the young Ivan, attempts to absolve himself from the killing of a goose on the grounds that he had not physically committed the deed himself. Like Ivan, however, he is guilty by having put the idea in the mind of an accomplice.

points out, the same type of conflicting speech patterns which Ivan's devil uses to destroy Ivan's word occurs in Miusov's speech at the monastery.[54] At the same time, the physical description of Miusov: "просвещённый, столичный, заграничный и притом всю жизнь свою европеец, а под конец жизни либерал сороковых и пятидесятых годов" (I, i, 2, стр.10) also fits that of Ivan's devil. Thus, Miusov may also be seen as a material representation of Ivan's devil, who in the end brings about the complete collapse of Ivan's word.

Where Miusov begins the disclosure of Ivan's word as diabolic verbally through the purport of his words at the monastery and symbolically through his likeness to Ivan's devil, Rakitin, a third character who bears an envious contempt for Ivan and attempts to undercut his words, may be seen as a material representation of the evil side of Ivan's ideas taken to their extreme. As such, he can be seen as another material representation of Ivan's devil. Perlina writes: "The images of Rakitin and of the Devil form a synonymous pair in the novel. The former is the parodic product of Ivan's ideology. The latter is Ivan's hallucination."[55] Thus, Rakitin – paradoxically an atheist divinity student – echoes Ivan's ideas by speech and by actions, which, void of any integrity or sense of morality, indirectly express the idea that 'everything is permitted'. Ivan's philosophy, purposely contrary to the notion of Divine Fatherhood, is thereby clearly shown to be, in praxis, dark and despicable.

---

[54] Ibid, p.129.

[55] Varieties of Poetic Utterance, p.139.

The roles which Miusov and Rakitin play in undercutting Ivan's internal word are taken up in a more direct way by Smerdyakov, the illegitimate son of Fyodor Pavlovich and Ivan's principal negative alter-ego. That is, where Miusov and Rakitin prepare the way for the thorough discrediting of Ivan's word by presenting it as fundamentally negative and sinister, Smerdyakov brings it to the point where Ivan himself is forced to recognize this dark side of his inner self and his word. The formula which states that, in the absence of God the Father, 'all is permitted', is taken to its extreme by Smerdyakov, who deduces from it the permission to murder the biological father, Fyodor Pavlovich.

Smerdyakov receives Ivan's consent through a subtle conversation that takes place the day before the murder. This dialogue, Bakhtin points out, consists of three voices:

1) Smerdyakov's voice, which attempts to elicit from Ivan the permission to commit parricide,

2) Ivan's conscious voice, which is against the death of his father, and

3) the latter's covert voice, which actually desires the death of his father, but desires also that it be against his will, so that he will be able to consider himself free of any responsibility for the crime.[56]

Bakhtin continues to explain that Smerdyakov only hears Ivan's covert voice, interpreting what is actually Ivan's positive, conscious voice to be the insertion of the loopholes and sideward

---

[56] Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, p.219.

glances necessary to protect himself from any evidence that could prove his guilt. However, Ivan basically refuses to admit his desire for his father's death and only wants to acknowledge his conscious voice. As such, even though Ivan leaves the pre-murder 'conspiracy' meeting feeling uneasy, he attempts to convince himself that he cannot be held responsible for the crime, should it occur. Smerdyakov, on the other hand, believes that he has received Ivan's full support for the murder.

Still, the fact that Ivan is troubled by his responses to Smerdyakov suggests that in truth he knows he has communicated his consent, and therefore will be as guilty as Smerdyakov if the lackey completes the murder. The following day, on his way out of town, Ivan catches a glimpse of the truth about himself when, wondering why he had suddenly announced to Smerdyakov that he was going to Chermashnya, he whispers the words: "Я подлец!" (II, v, 7, стр. 304) Although it is understated, clearly, deep in his heart, Ivan understands his confirmation to Smerdyakov that he was going to Chermashnaya to be his subtle signature on the murder deal.

But, only after the parricide has been committed, through the last three conversations with Smerdyakov, is Ivan forced to recognize his guilt in the murder of his biological father and, correspondingly, the true implications of his philosophy devoid of the Divine Father. During the first conversation, Ivan, still only willing to admit his positive voice which was against the murder, convinces himself that Smerdyakov is innocent. In the second discussion, Ivan recognizes his negative voice for the first time:

suddenly it is clear to him that Smerdyakov *is* the murderer, and that he himself *is* a partner in the crime. The lackey, however, insists that he is innocent, so Ivan leaves a second time – apparently content to ignore the truth. Finally, during the last meeting with Smerdyakov, the truth of the murder mystery and of Ivan's word against God is unmistakably revealed. Smerdyakov directly confesses to the murder, describes how it had been committed, and implicates Ivan as the principal offender. He says to his stunned younger brother: "Вы убили, вы главный убивец и есть, а я только вашим приспешником был, слугой Личардой верным, и по слову вашему дело это и совершил." (IV, xi, 8, стр. 674) As a final clincher to this shocking accusation, the lackey adds the following as his principal motive: "Пуще всё потому, что всё позволено. Это вы вправду меня учили-с." (IV, xi, 8, стр. 683) Ivan is indeed hit with a double blow as he learns not only that he is responsible for the murder of his father, but also that his supposedly noble, humanitarian word of rebellion has generated the most despicable of crimes. Outraged, Ivan promises to do the virtuous thing and expose Smerdyakov and himself in court, even though, taken at his word, he does not believe in virtue.

From the moment of Smerdyakov's confession all of Ivan's former confidence and self-control vanish. Faced with the undeniable fact that he has murdered his biological father through a sinister liaison with his illegitimate half-brother, which was formed out of the idea that all is permitted, Ivan sees that, in

rejecting the Divine Father with a carefully planned word of spiritual rebellion, he has in truth aligned himself with God's greatest adversary: the devil. As he finds himself deeply tormented by this revelation, Ivan also recognizes, in his desire to confess, the side of himself which, disgusted by evil, deeply longs for the truth and goodness of a loving God. But, his once lofty philosophy, which covertly had called for hate instead of love, nihilism instead of faith, has denied him the ability to embrace the Divine Father. The unveiling of the full nature of this conflict within himself between good and evil is proof to Ivan of the failure of his word of rebellion. Thus, as he leaves Smerdyakov the third time, Ivan is left in limbo: his rebellion has been shattered, but at the same time he is unable to turn to God the Father. A severe, potentially fatal, mental breakdown results. Albert Camus writes of Ivan's plight: "Caught between unjustifiable virtue and unacceptable crime, consumed with pity and incapable of love, a recluse deprived of the benefits of cynicism, this man of supreme intelligence is killed by contradiction."[57]

Given that it is fundamentally the revelation of the demonic core of Ivan's word, and thus of the devil within him, which confirms his mental illness, it is not surprising that when he returns home after his last conversation with Smerdyakov he has a vision of the devil. The link between Smerdyakov and Ivan's devil is described thus by Danow:

---

[57] Albert Camus, trans. A. Bower, The Rebel, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1956), p.59.

> At the final meeting, gazing at Smerdyakov, Ivan sees that into that select elite for whom all is lawful, there has crept an insect; gazing upon his lackey, Ivan sees himself, and thus is provoked his nightmare: seeing himself, he sees his devil.[58]

Smerdyakov shows Ivan's ideas to be centered in darkness and crime and also provokes a revelation of the schism within Ivan which brings him to an awareness of the ultimate failure of his word. Through the devil, who, as Ivan's hallucination, is a personification of his inner nature, Ivan is provided with an explicit picture of his true self. First of all, he is humbled as he sees his devil to be, like Miusov, no more than a petty, outdated Russian liberal who echoes his ideas in a mocking, derisive tone. In light of what has already been shown about his word, this final travesty of Ivan's word makes its defeat even more obvious. Secondly, the devil says of himself that most of all he desires to do good and serve God, and laments that by some twist of fate he has been forced to rebel against the Divine Father. Thirdly, the devil informs Ivan that he too desires to praise God, and that as such his purpose is to instill in Ivan the smallest seeds of belief. Paradoxically, the devil fulfills the function of directing Ivan toward God.

Ivan is no less tormented after his visit with the devil. There are, however, specific signs which indeed indicate that he may come out of his breakdown choosing God the Father and belief:

---

[58] Structural Principles of *The Brothers Karamazov*, p.126.

1) even though he had said he was unable to love his fellow man, Ivan demonstrates great compassion for a dirty, drunken peasant, to whom he had previously behaved violently; he carries the man on his back to an inn, insures that he is cared for by a doctor and provides generously for all the possible expenses;

2) while he had said that he does not believe in virtue, Ivan confesses in court that he is the murderer of his father, even though he knows that, without Smerdyakov to testify, he will not be believed;

3) during the last meeting with Alyosha, Ivan feverishly tells him about his visit with the devil, how the devil had seen much that was true in him and how the devil had also seen that he would perform a deed of great virtue.

As had been the case with Dmitry, Alyosha expresses the intuition that Ivan, too, may be saved. Yet, he also recognizes the possibility that Ivan, like his Grand Inquisitor, will continue to refuse to submit to his inner longing for the Divine Father. He describes the change that had come over Ivan thus: "Бог, которому он не верил, и правда его одолевали сердце, всё ещё не хотевшее подчиниться." (IV, xi, 10, стр. 710) Thus, it seems that Ivan's future is ultimately unfinalized. He had been free to reject the truth and to rediscover it. He is also free either to accept it conclusively or to continue on his path toward destruction. Still, one can maintain that the author privileges Alyosha's concluding words when the young novice monk says:

> Бог победит! . . . Или восстанет в свете правды, или . . . погибнет в ненависти, мстя себе и всем за то, что послужил тому, во что не верит. (IV, xi, 10, стр. 710)

During the previous discussions centering around Dmitry and Ivan, Alyosha – the youngest brother – has been mentioned briefly in a number of instances:

1) with regard to Dmitry – two days before the parricide, for which Dmitry is convicted, Fyodor Pavlovich's oldest son confesses to Alyosha the burning conflict within his heart between a longing to serve God the Father and his Karamazovian, sensual lust for depravity, which he fears could bring him to murder his biological father;

2) with regard to Ivan – in a dusty, dark tavern, Fyodor Pavlovich's second son also sees in Alyosha someone to whom he can reveal his private thoughts: during their meeting, Ivan voices his internally persuasive word of spiritual rebellion against God, which is begun with the tales of suffering children and completed in the legend of the Grand Inquisitor; at the same time, however, he finds himself admitting to Alyosha an ardent love of life and truth, which is fundamentally redemptive in nature;

3) as a young man of insight – Alyosha perceptively sees behind the mask worn by Ivan: he realizes that the legend in truth expresses Ivan's deep unconscious admiration for Christ; that is, the 'poem' instead of being a criticism of Jesus, as had been intended, is rather in praise of him; as well, Alyosha recognizes in the person of the Inquisitor Ivan's subconscious knowledge of the true, dark nature of his rebellion against the Divine Father;

4) as a bearer of truth – near the end of the novel, Alyosha speaks authoritatively about the fate of his two brothers with respect to their individual quests for Divine Fatherhood: Dmitry will ultimately accept God and the redemptive power of suffering by choosing to go to Siberia; Ivan too has been overwhelmed by the truth of God; as such, he will either rise in the light of Christ or perish in hate because of the hell that will continue to remain in his heart; nevertheless, Alyosha concludes confidently, whatever the outcome may be, God will reign victorious.

It is most uncommon to be able to speak with such authority at the tender age of twenty and to be regarded as a confidant of so many – for, indeed, it is not just his two older brothers who confess to Alyosha, but all the positive characters in the novel.[59] But then, from the beginning, Alyosha is depicted as an extraordinary character. First of all, in the preface to The Brothers Karamazov, Dostoevsky's authorial persona identifies Alyosha as his main hero, and adds that he considers him to be a remarkable, if somewhat eccentric, man. Secondly, and more significantly with regard to the theme of fatherhood, Alyosha is introduced by the chronicler in reverent tones which occasionally wax hagiographical. The following details of his childhood and early life, which could well refer to any number of saints whose lives have been recorded in the *Жития*, point to God as a loving and protective father:

---

[59] Varieties of Poetic Utterance, p.190.

1) **An unusual childhood incident that marked him as chosen by God:** when Alyosha was just two years old, his mother had held him before an icon and, sobbing hysterically, she had prayed to the mother of God for him; we are told that Alyosha always remembered this moment, how the slanting rays of the setting sun had shone on the icon, how beautiful his mother looked, kneeling in prayer, and how he felt as though from that day onward he was placed "под покров богородице;" (I, i, 4, стр.19)

2) **Early signs of an advanced inner spirituality or 'other-worldliness':** disinterested in the usual childhood games, Alyosha was always very reserved and quiet – not because he was shy or unsociable, but:

> от какой-то как бы внутренней заботы, собственно личной, до других не касавшейся, но столь для него важной, что он из-за неё как бы забывал других;" (I, i, 4, стр.19)

3) **An extraordinary love for people combined with an ability to awaken in everyone an instant, but genuine love in return:** "Людей он любил: он, казалось, всю жизнь жил, совершенно веря в людей;" (I, i, 4, стр.19) at the same time, "дар возбуждать к себе особенную любовь он заключал в себе, так сказать, в самой природе." (I, i, 4, стр. 20) The chronicler adds that people were naturally drawn to Alyosha because he refused to sit in judgement of others and was never shocked at what he witnessed or heard: "Он всё допускал, нимало не осуждая, хотя часто очень горько грустя;" (I, i, 4, стр.19)

4) a firm decision to dedicate his life to the service of God by choosing monasticism over marriage[60]: Alyosha believed in and searched for the truth, the chronicler writes, and, "задумавшись серьёзно, поразился убеждением, что бессмертие и Бог существуют." (I, i, 5, стр. 27-28) Partly because of the overwhelming impression that the revered elder, Father Zosima, had made on him, and seeing the life of a monk as the "идеал исхода рвавшейся из мрака к свету души его," (I, i, 5, стр. 27) he decided to enter the monastery. When the chronicler further adds that the young man's decision may have had something to do with the memory of his mother holding him before the mother of God, or, more mystically still, that it was possible that "подействовали [на него] и косые лучи заходящего солнца пред образом," (I, i, 5, стр. 28) the idea that there might have been some element of divine intervention is strongly suggested.

These introductory observations, which draw a parallel between events in Alyosha's early life and those which typify a saint, point to the first of three holy figures whose lives and words are mirrored by Alyosha. The reflection of these figures in Fyodor Pavlovich's youngest son both explain and justify the inner path that he takes from uninformed belief in the Divine Father through a brief but deep period of doubt to a firm conviction of the truth of God as a loving, just father.

---

[60] While during the course of the novel Alyosha is seen to commit to Lize and marriage (in part as a result of Zosima's testament), this does not negate Alyosha's initial wish to pursue monastic celibacy.

The second figure whom Alyosha mirrors is Father Zosima, the novel's revered elder and religious teacher. Where Dmitry and Ivan demonstrate their rejection of Fyodor Pavlovich as a father figure by harboring a deep desire to kill him, Alyosha also turns away from the lecherous old man by looking to Zosima as a surrogate father. In this wise, holy man, he recognized a mentor and role model, after whom he wished to pattern his life. The chronicler writes that "всею горячею первою любовью своего неутолимого сердца" (I, i, 4, стр.19) he had passionately embraced the elder and all that he stood for.

During the time that Zosima is alive, Alyosha speaks very little about spiritual matters. Rather, he is most often seen as the quiet messenger,[61] listening compassionately to the problems of those around him and attempting to calm the twisting storms that are being set off by the other members of his family. When he does speak, however, his words echo those of his surrogate father. Because of the high authority which the elder's words command in the novel, Alyosha's speech also has the force of truth. Perlina argues that this is why "all other personages in The Brothers Karamazov . . . are so eager to know his opinion."[62] As well, for the same reason, these characters naturally find themselves confessing to him; unconsciously, they seek his approval.[63]

Indeed, from the beginning, Alyosha's opinion is held in high regard among his peers. However, at this early stage in his

---

61 Structural Principles of *The Brothers Karamazov*, pp.59-60.

62 Varieties of Poetic Utterance, p.44.

63 Ibid.

spiritual journey, Alyosha, who speaks only through Zosima, has clearly not yet found his own internally persuasive voice. That is, he has not yet made Zosima's faith in God his own. Instead, he relies completely on the elder for guidance and support. As such, when Alyosha's spiritual father dies, leaving his young disciple alone to face the world, Alyosha's faith in God the Father is deeply shaken when particularly traumatic events accompany that death:

> То-то и есть, что вся любовь, таившаяся в молодом и чистом сердце его ко 'всем и вся', в то время и во весь предшествовавший тому год, как бы вся временами сосредоточивалась, и, может быть, даже неправильно, лишь на одном существе преимущественно, по крайней мере в сильнейших порывах сердца его, – на возлюбленном старце его, теперь почившем. (III, vii, 2, стр. 367)

Nadine Natov writes: "Paradoxically, Alesha's love and faith in Zosima will engender crucial temptations and cause the most serious moral and religious crisis in his life."[64]

Natov continues to explain that during this period of crisis, Alyosha's faith is met with the most severe test: in reverse order, he is subjected to each of the temptations which Christ had suffered in the desert. Alyosha's response to these temptations demonstrate that truth and happiness are to be found in choosing the fatherhood of God, not Satan's offers of worldly satisfaction as Ivan's Inquisitor had maintained.

---

64 Nadine Natov, "The Ethical and Structural Significance of the Three Temptations in *The Brothers Karamazov*," Dostoevsky Studies, vol.8, 1987, p.18.

The first temptation that Alyosha must endure – Christ's third, which offers the son of God worldly dominion if he will worship Satan – is sparked by Ivan, during their meeting at the tavern. In rejecting God's world and building a counter-system for humanity that excludes divine grace, Ivan has indirectly pledged allegiance to the devil; he has, thereby, succumbed to the third temptation. As such, when he attempts to elicit his younger brother's approval in the bar, Ivan, who figuratively stands in the place of the devil, is asking for Alyosha's compliance with the 'wise spirit of death and destruction'. Disturbed by the conversation, Alyosha asks Ivan why he is trying to test him. Ivan responds: "Ты мне дорог, я тебя упустить не хочу и не уступлю твоему Зосиме." (II, v, 4, стр. 264) The extent to which the temptation raised by Ivan has penetrated Alyosha's consciousness is clear when, deeply tormented by the scandal of the elder's decay, he echoes his older brother's very words of rebellion. He says: "Я против бога моего не бунтуюсь, я только 'мира его не принимаю'."(III, vii, 2, стр. 370)

Indeed, the incident that ultimately sparks Alyosha's anger toward God, and which provokes him to question divine justice, centers around the decay of Zosima's body. All the people who had heard of the great elder, including Alyosha and his closest disciples, expected that, in keeping with reports of miracles recorded in the Russian Orthodox *Жития* God would indicate the elder's saintliness by miraculously protecting his body from natural decomposition. When the body not only begins to smell,

but deteriorates more rapidly than usual, many believe that this is instead a sign that the man had actually been a follower of the devil. Malcolm Jones sees in Alyosha's reaction to the denied miracle an indication that the young novice has succumbed to the second temptation. The same syllogism that is inherent in the devil's suggestion that Christ throw himself from the temple pinnacle because God's angels will bear him up could also be deduced from Alyosha's succumbing to the superficial wish to be shown physical evidence of his spiritual father's saintliness, and, when it fails to happen, charging God with unjustly allowing Zosima's name to be disgraced:

1) God will protect the righteous from any natural processes which will be harmful;

2) Jesus and Zosima are among the righteous;

3)Therefore, God will protect them from harmful natural processes.[65]

The death of his spiritual father and the knowledge that his faith in the Divine Father is also disintegrating reduce Alyosha to the point of despair. He is, therefore, easy prey for Rakitin, who attempts to corrupt him with the the devil's first temptation by luring him to the pleasures of the flesh.[66] Although the

---

[65] Malcolm Jones, "'The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor': The Suppression of the Second Temptation and Dialogue with God," Dostoevsky Studies, vol.7, 1986, pp.126-128. Also, in this regard, V. Terras points out that the decay of Zosima's body indicates that, even in death, the elder denied the superficial type of miracle that Ivan's Inquisitor had propagated. As such, it may be seen as his 'last word' in the ideological 'debate'. See V. Terras, A Karamazov Companion, pp.57-58.

[66] "The Ethical and Structural Significance of the Three Temptations in *The Brothers Karamazov*," p.22.

deceitful divinity student does not ask him to turn stones into bread, he does give him food and vodka at a time when Alyosha should be abstaining. He then offers to take him to Grushenka; "Rakitin is sure that Alyosha too has a 'Karamazov nature' and can be easily tempted by sensuality."[67] Paradoxically, however, rather than being seduced, he instead finds in Grushenka the way back to God. Where, initially, there is no doubt that she had intended to seduce him, the news that his elder has just died effects a rapid change in her attitude. Moved by compassion for Alyosha and struck by the gentle young man's innate goodness, Grushenka is filled with the sense of her own sinfulness. Like most of the other personages in the novel, she finds herself confessing to him her innermost torments. Grushenka concludes by telling the tale of the one onion. As the story reads, a woman damned to hell is given the opportunity to be dragged out of hell by her guardian angel on the strength of the one onion which she had long ago given to a beggar, as her single act of love. This tale, in combination with Grushenka's expression of her own wickedness, touches a deep chord in Alyosha's heart. He says to her:

> Я шёл сюда злую душу найти – так влекло меня самого к тому, потому что я был подл и зол, а нашёл сестру искреннюю, нашёл сокровище – душу любящую... Ты мою душу сейчас восстановила. (III, vii, 3, стр. 381)

---

[67] Ibid.

At the same time, Grushenka feels that she has found in Alyosha someone who will forgive her, despite her wickedness. She says:

> Я всю жизнь такого, как ты, ждала, знала, что кто-то такой придёт и меня простит. Верила, что и меня кто-то полюбит, гадкую, не за один только срам!.. (III, vii, 3, стр. 388)

As Alyosha leaves Grushenka's, he finds himself spiritually revived by their 'mutual onion giving'; only now, for the first time, does he understand what it means to be truly responsible 'for everyone and everything'.

Feeling a strong need to pray, Alyosha returns to the monastery. He enters the elder's cell at the moment when Father Paisii begins reading the gospel story of the wedding at Cana – the tale of Jesus' first miracle. On his knees, he falls into a half dream state during which the authoritative words of scripture become incorporated into his own reflections on spiritual matters. Where Ivan's charge that Jesus was the cause of man's suffering had essentially been at the root of Alyosha's fall from grace, the truth of the notion that Christ had instead come to provide men with happiness is suddenly impressed upon his consciousness. In a voice which, for the first time, is his very own, he is able to speak this idea with authority: "Не горе, а радость людскую посетил Христос, в первый раз сотворяя чудо, радости людской помог..." (III, vii, 4, стр. 390) Having uttered these words, he suddenly finds that he is being called to the wedding feast by Zosima, a celebration at which Christ is present. The elder explains that he himself had been invited because of the

onion he had once given, and that now, because Alyosha too had given an onion to Grushenka he has also been invited. In the final part of his dream, Alyosha hears the elder speaking to him in a fatherly, loving manner. He says: "И ты, тихий, и ты, кроткий мой мальчик, и ты сегодня лукovку сумел подать алчущей. Начинай, милый, начинай, кроткий, дело своё!" (III, vii, 4, стр. 390) Encouraging him as a true father, Zosima directs the young man into the world where he too will come to fulfill the role of a spiritual father.

Symbolically, Alyosha's dream that he has been invited to the wedding feast represents the final stage in the reader's witnessing Alyosha's conversion to Christianity: his own individual 'marriage in Christ', to use Saint Paul's metaphor. To consummate this event, Alyosha goes outside and prostrates himself on the earth, asking for its forgiveness.

> Он целовал её, плача, рыдая и обливая своими слёзами, и исступленно клялся любить её, любить во веки веков.... Какая-то как бы идея воцарялась в уме его – и уже на всю жизнь и на веки веков. Пал он на землю слабым юношей, а встал твёрдым на всю жизнь бойцом и сознал и почувствовал это вдруг, в ту же минуту своего восторга. (III, vii, 4, стр. 393-394)[68]

As Zosima had previously commanded on many occasions, Alyosha leaves the monastery and sets out into the world to bring

---

68 Where it was chiefly Alyosha's earthy 'Karamazovian' passion which allowed him to fall into doubt and be tempted, it was also through this same passion that he is able to find his way back to God. Thus, even though *mother earth* is very much connected in the mind of the Russian believer with the mother of God, and hence this could explain Alyosha's actions at this point, his kissing the earth may also symbolize his recognition of all aspects of his earthy, sensual nature.

the message of God to Russians. Where, originally, Alyosha was said to mirror, first, the life of a typical saint and, secondly, the words and teachings of Father Zosima, at this stage he may be seen to reflect more directly the life of Christ. Reborn as a true *son of God*, Alyosha, who had previously been a spiritual son to Zosima, is able to become, like Jesus, a father figure to a group of 'disciples'. As Christ had chosen the apostle Peter to be the 'rock of his church', Alyosha singles out Kolya, the former pseudo-atheist-socialist and double of Ivan, to be his strongest representative. Following the funeral of the young Ilyusha, Alyosha delivers, through the children of Russia, his first address to the people (народ). This 'speech by the stone' runs parallel to Christ's sermon on the mount: the syntax, parable-like tone, and authoritative quality of Alyosha's somewhat unorthodox message are all distinctive features of what had long ago been Jesus' first public sermon; as well, where the ancient sermon celebrates the joy which will be rewarded to the down-trodden of the world, Alyosha encourages the boys to see in the memory of Ilyusha – a suffering, but somehow joyful child – evidence of the infinite love and compassion of the Divine Father.

Moreover, in retrospect, there are also significant parallels that can be seen to have existed between Jesus and Alyosha even before the latter's conversion. The following similarities are worthy of note:

1) neither began their mission to the world immediately with adulthood;

2) both had to undergo and ultimately resist the three temptations of the devil before going out into the world as leaders;

3) where the miracle at Cana was the event which indicated that Jesus was now ready to 'go about his *father's* work' – a mission which was to change all history, it is the message of this same gospel story which brings Alyosha to the stage where he is also prepared to do the work of the Divine Father, 'на всю жизнь и на веки веков'.

Clearly, at the point where the novel ends, with the powerful 'speech by the stone', there is every indication that Alyosha – like Jesus, Zosima, and the saints of the past – is committed to live out the rest of his life in the service of God. His internally persuasive voice, no longer an 'imitation' of his elder's, has become its own authoritative expression of the truth of God the Father. At the same time, because Alyosha's words accord with scripture, his voice is virtually synonymous with Zosima's and, as well, with that of Christ, the Divine Logos incarnate.

Nevertheless, even Alyosha's future, like Dmitry's and Ivan's, must remain ultimately unfinalized. The gift of free will, which Ivan's Inquisitor had attempted to destroy because he believed human beings were not capable of such a serious responsibility, not only allows man to search for truth, but it also forces him to choose continuously between good and evil, between accepting the fatherhood of God or serving Satan. While this means that Dmitry and Alyosha, who have for the time being chosen to serve God, will still be subjected to evil, and may even

fall, it also means that Ivan, who may for the moment continue to adhere to his godless idea, will nevertheless have other chances to choose the truth of the Divine Father. Alyosha indirectly confirms this when, in the concluding chapter of the novel, he says to the children: "Может быть, мы станем даже злыми потом, даже пред дурным поступком устоять будем не в силах... (Epilogue, стр. 840) However:

> даже если и одно только хорошее воспоминание при нас останется в нашем сердце, то и то может послужить когда-нибудь нам во спасение. (Epilogue, стр.840)

CHAPTER FOUR: THE GREAT 'DEBATE'

Dmitry Karamazov says to his youngest brother: "Дьявол с богом борется, а поле битвы - сердца людей."(I, iii, 4, стр.117) And, in a previously cited letter to Maikov, Dostoevsky confirmed the centrality of the spiritual quest for God when he wrote the following concerning The Brothers Karamazov:

> Главный вопрос, который проведется во всех частях- тот самый, которым я мучился сознательно и бессознательно всю мою жизнь- (это) существование Божие.[69]

The spiritual conflict between faith and the rejection of the Divine Father is not only the crux of the theme of fatherhood, but also it is the point at which the heterogeneous elements of The Brothers Karamazov converge. During the first group scene of the novel, what would perhaps have been a dormant desire for God is awakened in the hearts of the Karamazov brothers by the revered spiritual father, Elder Zosima. As the action progresses, the ambivalence that these brothers exhibit toward their biological father, Fyodor Pavlovich, is seen to be an external manifestation of a deep internal dualism, which they must eventually address. This dualism involves a longing to become a son of the Divine Father while being distracted from this desire by the passions and torments of the world. At the same time, the novel's diverse story-lines – all of which ultimately center around two incarnate father figures – are linked thematically in that together they

---

[69] Письма II, 1867-1871, op cit.

foreground the main issues in the problem of faith in God that beset the brothers on an ideological level.

Clearly, the dichotomy between faith and unbelief is addressed on every level of the novel's architectonics. The result is a literary polyphony whereby the elements comprising this problem are first introduced in their relatively simple forms and then played against one another in increasing degrees of complexity until they are brought to a resolution in a crescendo at the climax of the novel.

The two opposing sides of the dichotomy between faith and unbelief are internalized within each brother, who expresses them both verbally and through actions. On a higher level, the problem is addressed ideologically through the dialogic interactions which take place between characters. In the previous chapters, the issues surrounding this spiritual conflict have been discussed purely with regard to showing how the intricate polyphonic system, established by thematic/verbal counterpoint, both enriches the theme of fatherhood and facilitates the emergence of the truth sought by the brothers. The discussion of fatherhood, however, is clearly not complete without a consideration of the *great 'debate'* between Ivan, who in the latter part of Book Five argues against God and the justice of Christ's work in the world, and Zosima, who in the following book puts forth a Christian perspective[70] as the only answer to man's quest for truth.

---

[70] As noted at the end of chapter one of this study, the Christianity which Zosima presents is rooted in the Orthodox tradition. However, there is

According to many critics, the ideological debate is one-sided, with the victory distinctly won by Ivan.[71] In particular, they contend that Zosima has failed to counter Ivan's principal argument, which centers around the problem of innocent suffering. These critics, however, have made two serious errors: 1) hastily placing Ivan's "Великий Инквизитор" among the greatest critiques of Western Christianity, they have, as though by omission, neglected to see the fundamental misconception on which the legend is based; and 2) they dismiss Zosima's position as invalid because it is not based on reason, and in so doing they misunderstand the basis for his views.

First of all, by omitting the Divine Father from his argument, as will be explained, Ivan begins from a premise which is false. He proceeds by stating what is commonly recognized as true, but which in light of his faulty premise is subtly undermined. He then concludes, reasoning correctly from his faulty premise, with what appears to be the most logical alternative to the falsified truth. This pattern is repeated throughout his argument in a manner which both allows the pivotal element that has been omitted to be disguised – so that its absence is barely perceptible to the reader – and allows an argument to be presented which is highly persuasive. Secondly,

---

reason to suggest that his version of Christianity is not entirely in keeping with Orthodoxy. For example, his exhortation that men pray for the souls of suicides, his hint that perhaps all men are saved, and the idea that men may enhance the salvation of others by accepting responsibility for their sins are views which distinctly depart from the official position of the Orthodox church in Russia.

71 Nathan Rosen, "Style and Structure in *The Brothers Karamazov*," Russian Literary Triquarterly, vol.1, 1971, p.352.

the notion of the Divine Father – the factor which Ivan has dismissed from his thinking and which grounds his critique of Christ in error – is not only highlighted by Zosima's discourse, but it is the foundation of the monk's position. At the same time, the truths which Ivan perverts as a result of his faulty premise are given their correct formulation by the elder: that is, Zosima shows these statements to fall short of the truth by demonstrating how they are answered most completely only within the framework of Orthodox Christianity. Thirdly, the truth of Father Zosima's position, as it stands against Ivan's, is enhanced by the events of the novel and the paths of the brothers.

In this chapter, through deconstructing Ivan's argument, I intend to show that the fallacies hidden in the legend are emphasized by Zosima in a manner which reinforces the authority of the latter's position. Moreover, by the additional evidence of the plot, Zosima's position, not Ivan's, will be seen to resemble most closely the answer found to the search for fatherhood in The Brothers Karamazov.

Ivan declares to Alyosha that it is not God whom he rejects, but the created world. Yet, underlying his critique of the divine order of the universe is his omission of the notion of a God who lovingly and justly bestows upon men the grace to overcome the torments of the world. Consequently, the world which Ivan perceives as flooded with horrible atrocities committed daily against children, is one where divine grace is not even intuited as a possible solution. And so, having denied God the role of divine grace in salvation, he concludes erroneously that salvation is

unjustly paid for by the innocent tears of these children. On the basis of this misconception, Ivan asks, rhetorically, if there is a single creature who could forgive the offences committed against an innocent child, or who would even have the right to do so. Alyosha responds that this creature is Christ: "Оно может всё простить, всех и вся *и за всё*, потому что само отдало неповинную кровь свою за всех и за все." (II, v, 4, стр. 267) But, just as Ivan has divorced God the Father from the affairs of men, he has also excluded the Divine Father from his relationship with Jesus. As such, he is unable to see how the blood of Christ could possibly make up for the tears of innocent children. Rather, Ivan, through the Grand Inquisitor, incorrectly holds Jesus to have been the one most responsible for the suffering of the world.

This second misconception, which stems from Ivan's suppression of Jesus' relationship to the Divine Father, is the thesis of his legend: "Великий Инквизитор." In the legend, Jesus returns to earth during the time of the Spanish Inquisition where he is confronted by the Inquisitor, a Roman Catholic Cardinal. The cardinal condemns Christ for having spurned man's only chance at happiness. By resisting the temptations in the desert, Jesus denied men miracle, mystery and authority: the three forces which would have allowed him to capture the hearts of all men forever and which would therefore have freed them from the pangs of conscience. Instead, he bestowed upon men great suffering by insisting that they be free to choose him of their own will, without recourse to miracle, mystery and

authority. Human beings, the Inquisitor maintains, are too weak and irresponsible to bear the freedon to make the decision to ignore their earthly desires and follow Christ solely on the basis of his 'godly' example. Consequently, the people are plagued by the dualism which inevitably results from the gift of freedom. He concedes that, indeed, there have been and will be a few men who are actually strong enough to rise out of this dualism and be *saved.* But what about the multitudes who are weak? Filled with bitterness, the Inquisitor completes his indictment of Jesus with an accusation reminiscent of Ivan's original complaint concerning the debt of suffering which innocent children pay for salvation, but with an interesting reversal; that is, having portrayed the masses of human beings as quasi-innocent sufferers, he concludes that Christ has denied them their place as children of God by excluding them from salvation. He says to Jesus:

> Чем виноваты остальные слабые люди, что не могли вытерпеть того, что могучие? Чем виновата слабая душа, что не в силах вместить столь страшных даров? Да неужто же и впрямь приходил ты лишь к избранным и для избранных? Но если так, то тут тайна и нам не понять её. (II, v, 5, стр.279)

The Grand Inquisitor reasons, incongruously, that if the unrequited suffering of innocent 'children of God' is an unfathomable mystery then 'everything is permitted' and so, in order to achieve happiness for mankind, he has the right to:

> проповедовать тайну и учить их, что не свободное решение сердец их важно и не любовь, а тайна, которой они повиноваться должны слепо, даже мимо их совести. (II, v, 5,

стр. 279)

The mystery, however, on which the Inquisitor bases his allegedly utilitarian order consists in his having replaced the freedom that is to be found in Christ with bondage to the devil via the three temptations in the desert.

The Inquisitor has offered men the 'earthy bread' which Christ rejected in the first temptation by satisfying their natural desires, even giving them permission to sin. In this way, he had hoped to free men from the burden of choice, to appease their consciences, and to provide them with communal worship – a longing, he argues, that has been the principal source of war and bloodshed. But, instead, the Inquisitor has actually sought to suppress the spiritual side of human beings which Christ defended, reducing mankind to the level of dependent, submissive slaves, capable only of happiness through ignorance.

The Inquisitor has also offered men what Christ rejected in the second temptation by using the authority which God gave to the leaders of the church to satisfy man's temporal desires and needs. Whereas, in refusing to throw himself from the temple pinnacle, Jesus demonstrates that the relationship which the Divine Father has to his people is not one that binds him to interfere miraculously with the human condition – i.e., with contradictory desires, suffering and death. Therefore, his spiritual representatives in the church should not attempt to interfere with these experiences either. But, neither the Inquisitor nor Ivan – who had originally lashed out against God for not having protected innocent children from suffering – can understand this because

both have ultimately denied the relationships which exist between the Divine Father and the world and between him and Jesus. As such, how could they possibly understand the nature of these relationships?

Malcolm Jones points out that Ivan, speaking through the Inquisitor, has even excluded the part in Matthew's account of the second temptation which refers to Jesus' relationship with God.[72] In Matthew 4:6, Satan says to Jesus: "Если Ты Сын Божий, бросься вниз, ибо написано: 'Ангелам Своим заповедаёт о Тебе'"; the Grand Inquisitor misquotes this account saying: "Если хочешь узнать, сын ли ты божий, то верзись вниз, ибо сказано про того, что *ангелы* подхватят и понесут его." (II, v, 5, стр. 277) [Italics P.A.] Paradoxically, the suppression of the Divine Father is the starting point which grounds Ivan's argument in error, while the charge that God should have interfered to alleviate the suffering of the world is the basis of his position.

The devil's third temptation offers Christ worldly dominion if he will bow down and worship Satan. By accepting this temptation, the Inquisitor has fulfilled man's need for authority and communal worship. The authority which he offers the world, however, is no longer the *Word* of God, incarnate in Christ, but a domineering secularized church which Ivan means to represent Western Roman Catholicism. Indeed, the cardinal explicitly forbids the expression of Christ's authoritative word

---

[72] Malcolm Jones, Dostoyevsky after Bakhtin, p.174.

when he says to Jesus: "Ты и права не имеешь ничего прибавлять к тому, что уже сказано тобой прежде." (II, v, 5, стр. 271)

Were the Inquisitor to have properly understood the word of God, he would not have attempted to prohibit Jesus from speaking because he would have known that all that was to be revealed by Christ before the end of the world was already completed sixteen hundred years ago in Judea, and thus, as Jesus's final silence before the Inquisitor indicates, Christ had no need to add to the revelation. But, the Inquisitor has misconstrued Christ's promise to the church in a manner which altogether severs the relationship that the word of God bears to the father. He has thereby substituted the authority of the pope and the church leaders for the authority of Christ, the living word of God. He says: "Всё, дескать, передано тобою папе и всё, стало быть, теперь у папы, а ты хоть и не приходи теперь вовсе, не мешай до времени по крайней мере." (II, v, 5, стр. 272) This blatant abuse of Christ's word to the church is only knowingly possible if one worships not God but the devil. Clearly, in attempting to undo the work of Jesus by accepting the devil's temptations in the desert, the Inquisitor has consciously bowed down before Satan. Although he has told his people that he rules in the name of Christ, he explicitly admits this to be a lie when he says to Jesus: "Мы не с тобой, а *с ним*, вот наша тайна! Мы давно уже не с тобою, а *с ним*." (II, v, 5, стр. 279)

If the Grand Inquisitor is so certain that the people would choose him over Christ, why does he need to pretend that he is

ruling in Christ's name? The only reason he seems to provide is that he can then bring men happiness by convincing them that they will be rewarded with salvation, while in truth, as he admits, "за гробом [они] обрящут лишь смерть." (II, v, 5, стр. 282) He says to Jesus: "Мы сохраним секрет и для их же счастия будем манить их наградой небесною и вечною." (II, v, 5, стр. 282) But if his system, founded on the temptations in the desert, were to provide men fully with happiness, as he had maintained, there would also be no need to promise his people heaven. Clearly, in attempting to appease the consciences of men and in dangling before them the reward of eternal life with Christ, the Inquisitor demonstrates that the spiritual fulfillment of salvation, not worldly satisfaction, is inherently essential to men's happiness. Indeed, he admits this and thus contradicts himself when he says:

> Тайна бытия человеческого не в том, чтобы только жить, а в том, для чего жить. Без твёрдного представления себе, для чего ему жить, человек не согласится жить и скорей истребит себя, чем останется на земле, хотя бы кругом его всё были хлебы. (II, v, 5, стр. 276)

Thus, by admitting a fundamental flaw, the Inquisitor shows his 'anti-Christian' system to be ultimately inadequate, for without divine grace he is only able to give mankind a limited, temporal happiness, not the eternal happiness Christ came to offer men.

Temira Pachmuss writes that, by revealing the happiness which the Inquisitor promises mankind to be a deception, Ivan,

"even if involuntarily, sides with Christ."[73] In light of the Inquisitor's rejecting Jesus and thus making it impossible for men to achieve the salvation which they most desire, a number of issues arise:

1) Ivan's principal complaint centers around the injustice of innocent suffering. But, instead of eliminating suffering as he had hoped, he eliminates the only possible solution to this problem – the reward of salvation by divine grace. As such, what results is "a tragic universe, an unjust cosmic order, or disorder, in which humanity at large is hopelessly condemned to pain and suffering."[74]

2) The Inquisitor condemns Christ for having saved only the chosen few who are strong enough to follow his example of righteousness; while the rest of mankind, who, weak and rebellious, are unable to follow that example on their own, will allegedly be be damned. Yet, he fails to mention that Christ not only gave men freedom of choice, but through the Divine Father he has also given them the grace to be able to choose correctly, despite their weaknesses, and offers them forgiveness when they sin. As Pachmuss points out, the Grand Inquisitor "does not take into consideration the fact that these same mutineers, if given the opportunity, can find their way back to Christ."[75]

---

[73] Temira Pachmuss, "The Metaphysics of Evil," "The Grand Inquisitor" and the Critics, ed. J.S. Wasserman, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970), p.126.

[74] Robert Louis Jackson, "The Wound and the Lamentation: Ivan's Rebellion," Modern Critical Interpretations: The Brothers Karamazov, ed. H. Bloom, (New York: Chelsea House, 1988), p.132.

[75] "The Metaphysics of Evil," p.124.

3) According to the Inquisitor, miracle, mystery and authority, the appeasement of conscience and communal worship are the things which men most desire, while Christ has denied men these. However, nowhere does he provide men with miracle; instead he has imprisoned Jesus for performing the miracle of raising a child from the dead. The only mystery he is able to supply is a lie: in Christ's name he promises men eternal happiness, whereas, by his own actions, he has made it impossible for men ever to achieve this. And, for him, authority is 'abject slavery' rooted in terror. Furthermore, instead of appeasing men's conscience, he sought to destroy in them any conscience whatsoever. Surely, if men truly desire miracle, mystery and authority, they can never find happiness under the Inquisitor for, without the true authority of the Divine Father, it is implied that no leader will ever be able supply such things. Consequently, given that men are indeed rebels by nature, as the Inquisitor maintains, how can he possibly expect that all men will worship him in common? Rather, they will revolt against him. The result, as is indicated by the Inquisition itself, will be bloodshed and suffering instead of the peace and happiness which the Inquisitor had planned.

Clearly, by omitting the Divine Father from the Grand Inquisitor's plan for man's happiness, Ivan has set up an argument which refutes itself. Where he had set out to discredit Jesus, he instead "reaffirms the necessity of the redeemer."[76] The

---

[76] "The Wound and the Lamentation: Ivan's Rebellion," p.132.

contradictions inherent in Ivan's argument, however, are subtly disguised and might therefore be missed were it not for Zosima's showing how the problems which Ivan raises can only truly be answered by returning God according to Orthodox belief to the role of 'father and saviour'. At the same time, the truths which Ivan distorts, and which thereby form his indictments against Christ, are given their correct formulation by the elder.

Father Zosima's discourse may be divided into two parts. In the first part, through personal examples from his own life, the elder demonstrates how the suffering and dualism that mankind face can be changed to joy by the miraculous power of love and the no less miraculous mystery of divine grace.

Zosima begins his testimony to his disciples with two episodes from his childhood which respond most directly to Ivan's criticism regarding innocent suffering. First, he recounts the story of his brother's deathbed conversion to Orthodox Christianity. Purely out of compassion for his mother, who was greatly saddened by her son's ambivalence toward spiritual matters, his brother Markel had finally agreed to observe the Lenten fast and to go to church. But, from the love demonstrated in this act, he is given the grace to recognize his sin and to turn to the Divine Father for forgiveness. Miraculously, in the midst of his suffering, he experiences a happiness greater than he had ever known. He explains that his joy has resulted from the realization of his guilt before all men and for everything. With a voice of authority, he declares that man will only be able to accept the injustices and suffering caused by human beings and thereby find true peace

and happiness if he recognizes that "воистину всякий пред всеми за всех и за всё виноват." (II, vi, 2, стр.313)

Secondly, Zosima tells of his own childhood experience of the Divine Father. When, during a church service, he hears the story of Job for the first time he says that he felt he had encountered "первое семя слова божия." (II, vi, 2, стр.316) Instead of being angry at God for having allowed Satan to destroy this righteous man's household – a charge which he says he later heard many bring against the Divine Father – he finds himself praising God along with Job. Most of all he is awed by the mysterious power of God's love to change Job's grief over his lost children into a quiet happiness. Zosima's particular comment on Job's children may be seen "perhaps as an indirect answer to Ivan's fixation on the suffering of children."[77] He has shifted the emphasis, however, from the question of why Job and his children must suffer to Job being bestowed with the grace to "recover from the loss of his first children and [to] love the new children which God has provided him."[78]

While it remains true that innocent suffering is unjust, these incidents demonstrate that neither God nor Christ is to be held responsible. Rather, God's authority is shown to be so powerful that from the suffering itself he is able to bring joy. In this way, Zosima shows how God has restored the balance of justice, without having to interfere with human freedom, by

---

[77] "Style and Structure in *The Brothers Karamazov*," p.357.
[78] Ibid.

miraculously bestowing upon men a capacity to experience and benefit from pain.

Zosima concludes his personal testimony with two episodes from his early adulthood. Where the previous stories centered around Ivan's initial problem concerning innocent suffering, the last two respond to Ivan's second principal complaint; namely, that men are too weak to rise out of the dualism caused by free choice and hence they will be unfairly damned. Zosima first tells of how, as a young man enslaved to drunkenness and debauchery, he was unexpectedly given the grace to choose to follow God. When a woman with whom he was secretly in love marries, out of pride he forces her husband to challenge him to a duel by grossly insulting him in public. The night before the duel, perhaps worried about his possible death, he strikes his servant violently. Filled with remorse, Zosima recalls the words of Markel regarding the guilt of all men and the need for forgiveness. The next morning he asks his servant to forgive him. Then, at the duel, he declines his shot and instead begs for the man's forgiveness. Like his brother, his conversion to Christianity is completed by the recognition that he is truly guilty before everyone and by his humble request for pardon.

The last incident which the elder recounts involves a similar sort of conversion. Shortly after his own miraculous transformation, Zosima gains the trust of a respected man who confesses to him that fourteen years ago he had murdered a woman. He describes how through the years he has suffered mercilessly, haunted by the crime he had once committed.

Although now the man has a beautiful family and a comfortable life, he is unable to enjoy these blessings. Finally, he becomes convinced that "объявив своё преступление, [он] излечит душу свою несомненно и успокоится раз навсегда." (II, vi, 2, стр. 334) However, until he had heard about Zosima's courage during the duel, he found that he was too weak to disgrace himself voluntarily. By the grace of God, he is provided with this example so that in unburdening his tormented conscience he is able to experience the true happiness which accompanies forgiveness.

Clearly these two episodes demonstrate that not only are the weak able to make the choice to follow God freely, but that it is in fact through a recognition of his very weakness that each man is open to receive the grace of God which enables him to rise beyond his earthly desires and choose correctly. While, as the Inquisitor had stated, it is true that people may well be too weak to make this choice with nothing but Christ's example, what the Grand Inquisitor neglects bears reiteration: man is not just given freedom of choice, but divine grace as well.

The two fundamental charges which Ivan levies against Christ are shown to dissolve at the point where Zosima returns the Divine Father to his proper relationship with Jesus and with the world. Indeed, where the Inquisitor was unable to provide men with miracle, mystery and authority, the elder demonstrates that the suffering and dualism that plague men can only be appeased by the miracle, mystery and authority of God's eternal love and forgiveness. Having thus illustrated the failure of Ivan's

argument by example, in the second half of his discourse Father Zosima highlights the errors inherent in the legend by authoritatively presenting his interpretation of the *word of God* (see footnote 70, page 135). The authority of the elder's position is particularly reinforced by its bearing on the manner in which 'his opponent's' argument refutes itself. The points which he makes may be summarized as follows:

1) Man cannot judge his neighbour because he too is just as guilty, for it is possible that were he, himself, righteous before all mankind then his neighbour might not have been driven to sin. (II, vi, 3, стр. 348) As such, Zosima entreats men: "возьми себя и сделай себя же ответчиком за весь грех людской." (II, vi, 3, стр. 347) Only then, he continues to explain, will people be able to avoid despair over the injustices wrought by men. In particular, the crimes committed against children are the most painful to accept. People must remember, however, that even if the offender:

> не может уже отказать себе во смрадном грехе, но всё же знает, что проклят богом его смрадный грех и что поступает он худо, греша. (II, vi, 3, стр. 342)

Believing therefore in divine truth, the transgressor still has the capacity to seek forgiveness and to atone for his deeds. Whereas the atheist, who perhaps may not have explicitly harmed a child, has declared that "нет преступления и нет уже греха." (II, vi, 3, стр. 342) How, then, can he possibly be forgiven if he does not even recognize the need? And where is the sufficient barrier

to his transgressing in the first place? In any case, whatever the outcome will be, the elder declares authoritatively that justice will be done. He says: "Верь сему, несомненно верь, ибо в сем самом и лежит все упование и вся вера святых." (II, vi, 3, стр. 348)

2) If in the name of humanitarianism people base freedom and happiness on fulfilling men's material desires, they will find their philosophy turned upon itself for:

> вместо свободы впали в рабство, а вместо служения братолюбию и человеческому единению впали, напротив, в *отъединение* и уединение." (II, vi, 3, стр. 340)

Rather, only by freeing himself from slavery to earthly pleasures, can man, with God's help, achieve spiritual freedom and thereby find happiness. (II, vi, 3, стр. 341)

3) Regarding those who scoff at Christians and attempt to correct the injustices of the world by reason alone, without Christ, Zosima explains that, in place of unity and peace, they will "кончат тем, что зальют мир кровью, ибо кровь зовет кровь, а извлекший меч погибнет мечом." (II, vi, 3, стр. 345) These would-be lovers of mankind have become so corrupted by Satan's pride that they are able to delude themselves into thinking they are performing great and wonderful deeds for humanity, while in truth they are only paving the way for their own damnation. (II, vi, 3, стр. 347) According to the elder, hell is none other than the "страдание о том, что нельзя уже более любить." (II, vi, 3, стр. 349)

This is not a condition which God unjustly brings on these men. Rather it is voluntary on their part: by basing their hopes on reason instead of love, they have gradually destroyed in themselves any capacity to love. "Для тех ад уже добровольный и ненасытимый; те уже доброхотные мученики." (II, vi, 3, стр. 351)

As has been demonstrated above, Father Zosima clearly "meets every challenge of the Grand Inquisitor head-on."[79] That he was not present at the tavern when Ivan presented his legend may be seen to enhance further the credibility of his discourse. That is, he is able to recount his stories and express the word of God freely, without the restrictions naturally governing a direct debate, and yet at the same time, inherently, his position refutes what critics have agreed to be a highly persuasive argument against Christ.

The validity of Zosima's standpoint and the failure of Ivan's atheistic ideology are also reinforced by examples provided in the novel itself. Through the suffering which the legitimate brothers experience as a consequence of the death of their human father, they are faced with the truth that only the Divine Father can heal the pain and correct the injustices which have been committed. With regard to Ivan's argument in particular, the example of Alyosha and Dmitry clearly illustrate that man is indeed able to live up to the 'terrifying gift of free choice'. Alyosha chooses to deny his desire for the Inquisitor's type of

---

[79] A Karamazov Companion, p.57.

miracle and instead is transformed in the midst of his despair by the true miracle of the grace of the Divine Father. In a similar manner, by Dmitry's sudden choice to accept responsibility for the parricide and seek forgiveness in suffering, "men enslaved by passion – the presumed subjects of the kingdom of the Grand Inquisitor – are shown to have the inner strength to overcome their passion."[80] At the same time, although Ivan does not convert to Christianity during the time of the novel, he demonstrates a fundamental belief in virtue by confessing his role in the murder of his father. Despite the argument which he puts forth in the legend, he is, as Zosima had seen, ultimately unable to live with the consequences of the idea that 'everything is permitted'. Tormented by a guilty conscience and incapable of calling on the Divine Father for forgiveness, Ivan succumbs to mental illness.

However, just as Ivan's two brothers are only truly open to accept God's grace during the most traumatic times of their lives, it is possible that Ivan, too, may rise from his broken state to be reborn as a son of the Divine Father. In this respect, the epigraph of the novel serves as perhaps the most direct answer to Ivan's argument which centers around the problem of suffering, for, as Terras explains, "it tells us that suffering and death are necessary so that there can be resurrection:"[81]

> Истинно, истинно говорю вам: если пшеничное зерно, падши в землю, не умрёт,

---

[80] "Style and Structure in *The Brothers Karamazov*," p. 362.
[81] A Karamazov Companion, p.58.

то останется одно; а если умрёт, то принесёт много плода.

(Евангелие от Иоанна,
глава XII, 24)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Where Grossman had been partially correct in identifying the uniqueness of Dostoevsky's art to consist in the novelist's ability to bring contrasting genres, plot elements and ideologies together into an integral and unified work of art, he had incorrectly attributed this quality to a unified, monologic philosophical plan. On the contrary, however, the heterogeneous material of Dostoevsky's novels can only be held together by the freedom which the characters are given to act out their unique lives and to speak in their own voices *without the interference of of a finalizing authorial voice.* With the characters free to express themselves fully at every level on which they participate in the novel, the problems that they address ideologically, through dialogue, are naturally mirrored by the actions and interactions which they themselves also freely determine, and this results in an overall coherence. Moreover, through the extensive use of thematic and verbal counterpoint, Dostoevsky, having brought his characters together from highly varied and sometimes 'inappropriate' backgrounds, allows for a fusion of contradictory genres, plot elements and ideologies. By this innovation, the author draws the reader actively into the dynamics of the novel and creates an elaborate, tightly knit web of themes and thematic variations which, as Mikhail Bakhtin argues, may be likened to a musical polyphony.

Through a discussion of the various levels on which the theme of fatherhood is expressed, it has been my intention to

demonstrate how the heterogeneous material of The Brothers Karamazov coheres around this theme within the framework of the polyphonic system described by Bakhtin.

First of all, while there are many levels on which the theme of fatherhood is expressed in the novel, this theme was shown to be two-fold in nature. At the highest point of abstraction, the theme of fatherhood entails the positive and negative dynamics that surround the quest for God, understood as a just and loving father. This quest, more specifically, consists in the attempt of the inherently dualistic characters to resolve the spiritual conflict between faith and the rejection of Divine Fatherhood. The practical, physical aspect of the theme of fatherhood involves interactions that center around the principal human father figures in the novel, Fyodor Pavlovich and the Elder Zosima. The relationships, often largely ambivalent, which the 'sons' establish with these father figures is indicative of their respective attitudes toward the Divine Father.

At the same time, the meeting that takes place in the holy elder's cell near the beginning of The Brothers Karamazov and the conflicts that are revealed there between Fyodor Pavlovich and his three legitimate sons – elements which are part of the novel's plot – both provoke in the brothers the dialogic interactions which partially motivate their respective paths toward discovering and accepting Divine Fatherhood and, as well, foreshadow the ideological 'debate' over faith and the rejection of God that occurs between Zosima and Ivan. Moreover, in the sense that the problems raised ideologically in the 'debate' – the same

problems addressed by each of the three brothers in his personal quest for fatherhood – are also treated in the plot where a practical solution is provided, one might say that the plot interacts dialogically with the ideological realm of the novel as an independent interlocutor. Clearly, the novel can most easily be divided according to plot, the dialogic paths of the three legitimate brothers, and the ideological 'debate'. As such, in attempting to demonstrate the unifying nature of the theme of fatherhood, I have discussed this theme as it is represented on these three levels.

In chapter two of this thesis, the dynamics surrounding the two-fold theme of fatherhood were shown to be exhibited by both the causal and structural components of plot. Through the discussion of 'causal plot' (understood as the causal movement of events in the time and space of the novel), the ambivalent attitude which each brother exhibits toward his biological father was seen to parallel his ambivalence toward the Divine Father. Interestingly, from the suffering that results from the death of the human father figures in the novel, the legitimate brothers are each given the capacity to accept the love and forgiveness of God. Dmitry and Alyosha actually commit passionately to Christianity. Although Ivan does not reach this stage, through a recognition of his role in the parricide, he is made aware of the utter failure of his rebellion against God, and thus indirectly moves closer toward faith.[82]

---

[82] One might note that even Smerdyakov – the illegitimate son of Fyodor Pavlovich – exhibits a possible desire to receive the forgiveness of God:

At the same time, the 'causal plot' was shown to respond to the criticisms which Ivan raises against God at the ideological level. First, Ivan's argument based on the injustice of innocent suffering is refuted by the subplot surrounding the suffering and death of the child Ilyusha. Second, Dmitry's experience of the redeeming nature of mutual responsibility which allows him, through divine grace, to accept the forgiveness of God demonstrates the fallacy of Ivan's assertion that men are too weak to choose God over their passions. Finally, where Ivan had privileged human justice over the judgement of God, Dmitry's false conviction illustrates the inadequacy of man's justice system.

Through the discussion of 'structural plot', the elements that form the two-fold theme of fatherhood were shown to be foregrounded by the creative ordering of events and by the technique of point and counterpoint. Also, it was argued that the structure of the novel, and, in particular, the chronicler's use of the enigmatic, serves to provoke the reader's active involvement in the same search for fatherhood in which the characters partake. The manner in which these techniques enhance the theme of fatherhood and produce a polyphonic structure was illustrated

---

when Ivan visits the lackey for the last time, he notices a book in Smerdyakov's room entitled "Святого отца нашего Исаака Сирина слово" (IV, xi, 8, стр. 676); this book predominantly expresses the idea that forgiveness is to be found in suffering and tears. However, in that Smerdyakov is shown to look increasingly unwell, he shares a further trait with Ivan, one that suggests that the lackey, too, is not above evil and restitution. At the same time, Smerdyakov displays an indifference to the book when he uses it inappropriately to hide the stolen money from Maria Kondratievna. His possession of the book in the first place combined with his disregard for it symbolically points to his ambivalence toward Orthodox Christianity – an attitude which is also shared, to various degrees, by the other Karamazov brothers.

through a detailed analysis of Book One, "История Одной Семейки." Here, drawing on David Danow's extensive study of 'subtexts' in The Brothers Karamazov, I demonstrated how, by the contrapuntal arrangement of 'subtext' and 'main text', the author was able both to foreground the traits of each legitimate brother which most explain his individual quest for fatherhood and also to foreshadow what will gradually develop into a pronounced link between the brothers' relationships to human fathers and their attitudes toward God. As well, the first seeds of the elements which were later seen to form the heart of the theme of fatherhood – Dmitry's possible involvement in the 'fateful' death of Fyodor Pavlovich, the role of Father Zosima, Ivan's rejection of God and hatred toward his father, and Alyosha's piety – were seen to be sown in the first Book.

Where through the analysis of Book One the focus was essentially on the three brothers, the discussion of plot was concluded with a general examination of the books and parts of the novel with respect to the contrapuntal arrangement of the brothers and the themes they embody within the broad framework of the theme of fatherhood. By the end of the Part One, all three brothers and their themes were introduced directly. As well, the parricide, which is the climax of the physical dimension of the theme of fatherhood, and the ideological 'debate, which is the high-point of the ideological dimension of the fatherhood theme, were foreshadowed. Part Two, centering principally around Ivan and Alyosha, was seen to deal on a higher plane with the theme of fatherhood: namely, with the

foreshadowed ideological 'debate' between Ivan and Zosima. In Part Three, the action centers predominantly around the more physical aspect this theme with the deaths of the two human father figures, Elder Zosima and Fyodor Pavlovich. Finally, Part Four was shown to resolve both dimensions of the theme of fatherhood and at the same time to reveal the explicit link between the higher and lower planes as consisting in Ivan's intellectual responsibility in the murder of his biological father. Where this link was seen to illustrate the defeat of Ivan's argument against God, as well as the inadequacy of human judgement, the Epilogue was shown to present Zosima's position in favour of Christianity as victorious.

In chapter three of this thesis, the inner motivations of the three legitimate Karamazov brothers, which illuminate their respective paths with regard to the quest for fatherhood, and which therefore underlie the actions and interactions discussed in the previous chapter, were given more detailed consideration through an analysis of discourse and character mirroring. At the same time, the link that in chapter two was shown to exist between the brothers' relationships to human father figures and their attitudes toward God was shown to be magnified by the dialogic interactions with take place and by verbal and situational echoing. One can summarize here the basic path that each brother takes and refer to the characters who mirror and provoke that path.

1) The path that Dmitry takes from parricidal intent to faith in God was seen to be both provoked and foregrounded by

his link with characters at various levels of commitment to God. At the beginning of Dmitry's path, his actions and words are mirrored by Fyodor Pavlovich, whom he had wanted to murder. Dmitry's second character mirror is Grushenka, the woman who was originally the cause of his parricidal tendencies. When, encouraged by Grushenka to seek the forgiveness of God, Dmitry undergoes a mystical conversion experience, the path that he has taken toward faith was seen to be mirrored by Zosima, the other father figure who represents the Divine Father in whom Dmitry had come to believe.

2) Ivan's path from intellectual rebellion against God to the failure of his word and his decline into mental illness was seen to begin with the inherent contradictions found in his word of rebellion – inconsistencies which stem from the inner conflict between Ivan's heart, which secretly longed for the love and forgiveness of a father-God, and his mind, which was unable to submit to this irrational desire. The ultimate undermining of his word is effected by characters who echo his words in a variety of tones ranging from naiveté, buffoonery, impishness and, finally, outright diabolism. While such character mirrors as Fyodor Pavlovich, Miusov, Kolya, and Rakitin were seen to weaken the persuasive force of Ivan's word, his principal character mirrors, Smerdyakov and the devil, were seen to reveal the failure of his word to Ivan himself, and thus to enhance his mental illness. At the same time, Smerdyakov and the devil were seen to foreground vividly the link between Ivan's part in the murder of

his biological father and his intellectual rejection of the Divine Father.

3) Alyosha's path from uninformed belief in the Divine Father through a brief but traumatic period of doubt to a firm conviction of God as a loving, just father was shown to be explained and justified by the reflections in his life of three pious figures: a typical saint, Zosima and Jesus. His early childhood life was seen to resemble that of a typical saint, and therefore to suggest the possibility of his having been chosen by God for a special purpose. During the early part of the novel, Alyosha, now a young man, was seen to mirror the words and ideas of Elder Zosima, his mentor and spiritual father. After undergoing a period of doubt, sparked by the death of Zosima and the scandal surrounding the decay of the elder's body, Alyosha's faith in God is renewed. It is at this point that, having emerged as a strong believer determined to bring God's message to the world, Alyosha comes to resemble Christ.

Even though there is every indication that Dmitry and Alyosha will continue to follow God, the respective paths that they follow are ultimately unfinalized. Just as they had been free to discover the love and forgiveness that is to be found in accepting the fatherhood of God, so too do they remain free to choose to reject the good they have experienced. This also means that Ivan, who leaves the novel without having resolved his tormenting spiritual dilemma, still possesses the freedom to choose to accept the God whom he had previously rejected. Since the framework of The Brothers Karamazov is a polyphonic structure where the

characters were given the freedom to act and speak without the interference of a finalizing authorial voice, then, as characters who leave the novel with their future still to come, there can indeed be no definitive word regarding the outcome of their individual paths.

Nevertheless, legitimately within the bounds of polyphony there can be a definitive solution to the ideological conflict between faith and the intellectual rejection of Divine Fatherhood. That is, although one might argue that Zosima's discourse in Book Six is predominantly monologic, the answer that he provides here to Ivan's argument against God, which was presented in Book Five, is the same solution that Dmitry, Alyosha *and Ivan* freely affirm through the outcome of their actions and through the dialogic interactions which shape their paths toward a belief in God.

Having shown in chapters two and three how the dichotomy between faith and unbelief was both expressed and resolved at the level of plot and at the level of dialogue (with respect to the paths of the three brothers), and therefore having illustrated the centrality of the spiritual quest for God – the higher plane of the theme of fatherhood – in chapter four, the discussion of the theme of fatherhood was concluded with an analysis of the *great 'debate'* between Ivan and Zosima.

Through deconstructing Ivan's argument, it was demonstrated that the fallacies hidden in the legend were emphasized by Zosima in a manner which reinforces the authority of the latter's position. First, the omission of God as a loving, just

father was revealed to ground Ivan's position in error. The subtle manner in which Ivan has disguised these errors was seen, however, to enhance the persuasive force of his argument. The various forms in which the Divine Father has been omitted and the errors that resulted may be summarized briefly:

1) denying God the role of divine grace, Ivan concludes falsely that salvation is paid for by the suffering of innocent children;

2) denying God his relationship with Jesus, Ivan, through the Inquisitor, concludes that the death of Christ was not sufficient to make up for the tears of children, and that in fact Jesus was most responsible for human suffering; and

3) denying the relationship between man, the world and God (an extension of his exclusion of divine grace), Ivan, again through the voice of the Inquisitor, concludes that the burden of free choice, which was placed on man by Jesus' rejection of the temptations, is both the root of man's suffering and also results in the unjust damnation of the weak majority. His Inquisitor proposes to restore happiness to mankind with the forces of miracle, mystery and authority by taking up what the devil had offered Christ in the temptations.

In having his inquisitor state that, in order for men to be happy, he had to deceive the people into thinking they would achieve salvation in Christ, Ivan not only admits his Inquisitor's system to be a failure but also indirectly sides with Christ. Moreover, by restoring God to his proper place as a just and loving father, Zosima was shown in the second part of this chapter to

illustrate, by personal examples in his own life and by words which echo Scripture, the manner in which only God is truly able to provide men with the miracle, mystery and authority which will bring them eternal happiness. At the same time, the credibility of Zosima's position was seen to be enhanced by his ability to refute Ivan's position at every point without having heard Ivan's actual argument; i.e., while not being bound by the constraints of a direct debate to answer Ivan's criticisms.

Finally, the unity that exists between the various levels on which the theme of fatherhood is expressed was reinforced at the end of this chapter by a brief reminder of how the points raised during the 'debate' between Ivan and Zosima were also illustrated through the events of the novel and through the respective paths of the three legitimate brothers. The truth that the brothers discover through their interactions with each other and with the other characters in the novel, and through the polyphonic interplay of diverse voices and ideologies was shown to be the same truth presented by Father Zosima. That is, Dmitry, Alyosha and Ivan all discover that the fatherhood which they seek throughout the novel can only be found most completely in God, not in the satisfaction of the material and physical desires provided by Satan, or, as Fyodor Pavlovich had described him, "отец лжи". (I, ii, 2, стр. 48)

Suggestions for Further Research

Although it has been my intention to demonstrate within the framework of the polyphonic novel how The Brothers Karamazov can be seen to be unified under the theme of fatherhood, there is still much that remains to be examined concerning the nature of polyphony in this complex novel. For example, the relation between time and narrative incident and the polyphonic relationships that exist between the books and parts of the novel have been treated only in an introductory manner in this study. Each of these topics could be the subject of another extensive study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amend, Victor, "Theme and Form in 'The Brothers Karamazov'", Modern Fiction Studies, vol.3-4 (1957-1959), pp.240-252.

Bakhtin, M., Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, trans. R. W. Rotsel. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1973.

_____ , Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, trans. and ed., C. Emerson. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minneapolis, 1984.

Belknap, Robert, The Structure of *The Brothers Karamazov*. The Hague: Mouton & Co. N. V., Publishers, 1967.

Børtnes, Jostein, "Polyphony in *The Brothers Karamazov*," Canadian-American Slavic Studies, 17, No.3 (Fall 1983), pp.402-411.

Busch, Robert, Humor in the Major Novels of F. M. Dostoevsky. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc., 1987.

Camus, Albert, The Rebel, trans. A. Bower. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1956.

Danow, David, Structural Principles of *The Brothers karamazov*. Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Univ. Press, 1977.

_____ , "Subtexts of 'The Brothers Karamazov'," Russian Literature, XI (1982), pp.173-208.

Достоевский, Ф., Братья Карамазовы . Москва: Художественная Литература, 1988.

_____ , ред. А. С. Долинин, Письма II, 1867-1871, Москва: Государственное Издательство, 1930.

Fanger, Donald, Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism. Cambridge: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965.

Goldstein, Martin, "The Debate in *The Brothers Karamazov*," Slavic and East European Journal, vol.14, no.1,1970, pp.326-340.

Grossman, L., Dostoevsky: A Biography, trans. M. Mackler. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc, 1975.

_____ , Поэтика Достоевского . Москва: Государственная Академия Художественных Наук, 1925.

Hackel, Sergei, "The Religious Dimension: Vision or Evasion? Zosima's Discourse in The Brothers Karamazov," Modern Critical Views: Fyodor Dostoevsky, ed. H. Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1988 (pp. 211-235).

Holquist, Michael, "The Carnival of Discourse: Bakhtin and Simultaneity," Canadian Review of Comparative Literature, vol.12 (1985), pp.220-234.

Jackson, Robert Louis, "The Wound and the Lamentation: Ivan's Rebellion," Modern Critical Interpretations: The Brothers Karamazov, ed. H. Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1988 (pp.119-133).

Jones, Malcolm, Dostoyevsky after Bakhtin. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990.

_____ , Dostoevsky: The Novel of Discord. London: Elek Books Ltd., 1976.

_____ , "'The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor': The Suppression of the Second Temptation and Dialogue with God," Dostoevsky Studies, vol.7, 1986, pp.126-128.

Matlaw, Ralph, The Brothers Karamazov: Novelistic Technique. The Hague: Mouton & Co., Publishers, 1975.

Mochulsky, K., Dostoevsky: His Life and Work, trans. M. Minihan. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1976.

Morson, Gary Saul, "The Baxtin Industry," Slavic and East European Journal, vol.30 (1986), pp.81-90.

_____ , "Verbal Pollution in *The Brothers Karamazov*," Critical Essays on Dostoevsky, ed. R. Miller. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co.,1986, pp.234-242.

Natov, Nadine, "The Ethical and Structural Significance of the Three Temptations in *The Brothers Karamazov*," Dostoevsky Studies, vol.8,1987, pp.3-44.

Pachmuss, Temira, "The Metaphysics of Evil," "The Grand Inquisitor" and the Critics, ed. J.S. Wasserman. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970 (pp.119-127).

Perlina, Nina, Varieties of Poetic Utterance. Lanham, M.D.: Univ. Press of America, 1985.

Praz, Mario, The Romantic Agony. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970.

Rosen, Nathan, "Style and Structure in *The Brothers Karamazov*," Russian Literary Triquarterly, vol.1, 1971, pp.352-365.

Rozanov, Vasily, Dostoevsky and the Legend of the Grand Inquisitor, trans. S. Roberts. London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1972.

Sandoz, Ellis, Political Apocalypse. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1971.

Shaw, Harry, Dictionary of Literary Terms. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1972.

Shneidman, N., "Murder and Suicide in *The Brothers Karamazov*: The Double Rebellion of Pavel Smerdiakov," Doskoevsky and The Human Condition After a Century, ed. A. Ugrinsky. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1986 (pp.23-29).

Terras, Victor, A Karamazov Companion. Madison, Wisconsin: The Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1981.

_____ , "Narrative Structure in *The Brothers Karamazov*," Critical Essays on Dostoevsky, ed. R. Miller. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1986, pp.215-223.

_____ , "On the Nature of Evil in The Brothers Karamazov," Text and Context: Essays to Honour Åke Nilsson, Stockholm Studies in Russian Literature, 23, ed. P. Jensen, B. Lonnqvist, F. Bjorling, L. Kleberg, A. Sjoberg. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1987, pp.58-64.

Trace, Arther, Furnace of Doubt: Dostoevsky & "The Brothers Karamazov." Peru, Illinois: Sherwood Sugden & Co., 1988.

Vivas, Eliseo, "The Two Dimensions of Reality," Dostoevsky: A Collection of Critical Essays. N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962, pp.71-89.

Wellek, René, "Bakhtin's View of Dostoevsky: 'Polyphony' and 'Carnivalesque'," Dostoevsky Studies, vol.1 (1980), pp.31-39.